This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE
CALLING OF A CHRISTIAN WOMAN
AND HER TRAINING TO FULFIL IT.

BY

MORGAN DIX, S.T.D.

A CHRISTIAN WOMAN

AND

G TO FULFIL IT.

THE CALLING OF A CHRISTIAN WOMAN

AND

HER TRAINING TO FULFIL IT.

THE CALLING OF

A CHRISTIAN WOMAN

AND

HER TRAINING TO FULFIL IT.

BY

MORGAN DIX, S. T. D.,

RECTOR OF TRINITY CHURCH, NEW YORK.

New Edition.

LONDON:

RICHARD D. DICKINSON, 89, FARRINGDON ST.

1884.

2 - f - 1 -

Bungay:
CLAY AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS.

NOTE.

I ASK the reader of the following lectures to bear in mind: 1. That they were written for my own people, and in the line of my usual pastoral work. 2. That they were not intended for publication. 3. That I now give them to the public in my own defence, because of the misrepresentation of my views by critics who had not the means of knowing exactly what I said, or all that I said. They are printed just as they were delivered, with scarcely the change of a word; and, in order to comply with the request of the publishers that they should appear at the earliest possible day, I am obliged to omit adding a large number of notes and quotations by which, if more time were allowed me, I should have endeavoured to fortify, by

strong authorities, the position which I have taken. I pray the reader to bear these points in mind as he proceeds. In their present crude state, these conferences may, perhaps, serve only as a brake on some wheels which appear to me to be revolving too fast for safety.

TRINITY RECTORY, *March* 7, 1883.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

PAGE

THE PLACE OF WOMAN IN THIS WORLD 1

LECTURE II.

THE DEGRADATION OF WOMAN BY PAGANISM, AND HER RESTORATION BY CHRISTIANITY 26

LECTURE III.

THE EDUCATION OF WOMAN FOR HER WORK ... 51

LECTURE IV.

THE SINS OF WOMAN AGAINST HER VOCATION ... 78

LECTURE V.

DIVORCE 102

LECTURE VI.

A MISSION FOR WOMAN 126

LECTURE I.

THE PLACE OF WOMAN IN THIS WORLD.

THE subject chosen for my lectures this year is the Calling of the Christian Woman, and her Training to fulfil it. I ought, perhaps, to begin with an apology for undertaking to speak to you on that theme. Women are, in many respects, more competent than men to teach their sex their duty and their mission. Some have written so admirably that it seems as if nothing had been left to say. Still, there are points at which even the best women diverge in their views, and topics on which the wisest may go wrong; and we priests who, whatever our personal shortcomings, have a commission from above, and a message to man from God, and are the mouth-piece of that Church to which His handmaidens belong, may be, and ought to be, able to help occasionally

by merely stating what the Bible and the Church declare on certain great matters, on which many lesser ones depend. With modesty, then, and with great deference for those whom I address, yet under a strong sense of duty, I proceed.

My subject brings us instantly to the question of the Place of Woman in the World. It is not worth while to beat about the bush, and waste time on side issues; let us go at once to the root of the matter. What did Almighty God, the Creator, the wise Father of all, make Woman for? What did He intend her to do? What did He not mean her to do, or to try to do? That these are vital questions is clear from the fact that we differ so greatly about the answers. It is a part of the restlessness of our time, in which so many traditions have been abandoned and so many convictions have changed; it is one of innumerable signs of the extent to which things have been upset, and confusion has been bred in the thoughts of men.

Every one sees and hears it; how the people dispute about everything, and doubt about that of which they dispute; how they grope for

light, while bragging of the brightness of these days. It is so pre-eminently in religion. The systems in which generations have been trained, living contentedly in them, and dying in peace and joy, are now assailed and denounced as mere superstition. The very Protestantism which the boys of fifty or a hundred years ago were taught to adore as the fountain of spiritual truth and the bulwark of the Gospel, for which, indeed, it was a synonym, is now arraigned, even by men inside its own circuit, put on its defence, and bidden to answer the charge that it has failed in everything demanded in a Religion, being no longer a teacher of the ignorant, a helper of the weak, and a comforter of the sorrowful, but rather a breeder of dissensions, the chief motive to general scepticism, and a broken reed piercing the hand that leans on it. In politics also everything is in flux; men, here and elsewhere, are in revolt against the institutions under which they are living; the imagination is filled with visions of Arcadia and Utopia; while reproaches are heaped upon the government, whatever it be, as the cause of everything that goes wrong. Nay, as to the

social order itself, what form soever it have, be it monarchy, empire, republic, radicals now appear who are bent on overthrowing it from bottom to top, and clearing the ground for some absolutely new thing; men who set us all agog with cries about capital as the enemy of labour, and labour as the sole cause of wealth, and wild demands for the abolition of social distinctions, the confiscation of property, and vesting the title to land in the State. While all this questioning is rife, it would have been a miracle if the active female mind had not turned to theorizing about the place of Woman in society; and, since nothing influences men so strongly as women, it would have been no less a miracle if men had not been found eager to follow suit, and agitate the questions about the status and the rights of Woman. Nor is it invidious to put it thus: that, as we are conscious of a movement tending to upset our old ideas about religion, political economy, and the social system, that movement should also threaten to revolutionize our thoughts about the place, the calling, the duties, and the education of Woman.

It is so; no one in his senses can doubt it; and I will add, at once, that, of all the move ments against the order of God's world, this seems to me the most formidable, and there fore to call for the freest handling. For if what amounts to an organized attempt to dis turb the true relations of men and women, and remove the woman from her proper place of work, were to succeed, the way would be open to success on every other line of the programme of revolution. Woman, in fact, holds the key of social order in her hand, under the ægis of Christianity; to wrench it from her by force, to steal it from her by flattery, would be to open the door to general pillage. If, under the pretence of improving her condition, crowning her with new honours, and giving her a higher rank and a wider mission, she should be displaced, dethroned, and degraded, the change in her, whom God designed to be a Queen of order and law, would be the signal for the anarchy which must succeed that fatal transformation.

The course of modern revolutionism proceeds just now on two lines—Woman's Rights

and Duties, and Woman's Training and Education. And, first, of the question of her rights. It is insisted that women have rights which somebody is withholding; that they are able to do, and ought to be doing, certain things which, under existing restrictions, legal, moral, or social, they are not permitted to do. But, in the question about rights, a prior one is contained—the question of powers. God's gift of power settles beforehand the question about rights. Wherefore, the moment the rights and duties of women are mentioned, we are brought face to face with the question, What is their place in creation? For to create, to make to be, is to invest with some degree of God's force and power; and each created thing varies from every other creature in that respect; and what we have to ask first is, What did God Almighty give to the woman in her creation? What is her place in the universe? What are her force and power? The answer to these questions will determine the later inquiry about her duties and her rights.

We are led to the same point the moment we begin to discuss the subject of a woman's

training. For, surely, by this time, all are agreed that the word "education" expresses a grand idea. Education does not consist in merely cramming the memory of a child with facts; that notion is exploded. Strictly speaking, education is a process *ab intra;* it is the educing, the drawing out what is already within; it is the development, the evolving, of germs implanted by the Creative Hand; the making a character to come forth, like a spirit at the call of the enchanter. But if it be so; if the educator assumes the existence of vital and productive powers in the subject of his work, what are those powers? What is it that you propose to educe? For what object, to what end, and how? That brings us to the same question: What is a woman, as God made her? What is her place among the works of God? No one can evade the scope of these queries except by assuming a practically atheistic ground, ruling God out of the subject, and claiming that it should be treated only on scientific and philosophic principles, and without reference to the teachings of religion. I fear that this course is actually taken

already, and that people are not awake to the fact. And I ask, now, by way of test, that whenever the subject of Woman's Education comes up for discussion, you Christians will insist on knowing first whether God is to be recognized, as not merely an element, but *the* first and essential element in the subject? The answer to that question, believe me, will throw amazing light on the path at once. We hear no end of talk about "higher education." I suggest, in advance, that what we wish to know about a woman's education, on any scale, be it higher or lower, is whether it is to set out from a true conception of her place, calling, and powers; and if it does not, but is to be conducted on some false theory, aiming at making her what she was not meant to be and can not be, it will be, not a higher education, but a lower, whatever the outward form; it will lower her, and help still more to disorganize the social system.

This must be settled before we proceed: the place of Woman in this world. But that includes, of course, another; the place of Man, her counterpart and companion. For at the

basis of the present agitation about her rights, her duties, her training, and her work, there seems to be a feverish uneasiness about her position toward man and his toward her. And I begin by asking: Are men and women to be treated as if they were one and the same creature with slight physical modifications not essential to the question of their place and work? Or is there a difference, a radical difference, a difference running through thoughts, aims, work, mission, everything? If so, that difference must be regarded in their education: if there be an essential, a radical difference, it would be a grave error to give the same training to each.

But here, at once, we affirm—not *I*, it is not merely my opinion—but *we*, God's messengers and witnesses, ordained and sworn to teach, not our own opinions, but the faith of the Church, affirm that fact, of the distinction between the Woman and the Man; a distinction original, essential, and everlasting. It is not a distinction evolved by ascetic philosophers in their studies, or imaginative sentimentalists in their dreams; by society in unjust and selfish

workings; or by the thought, or wish, or wisdom or unwisdom of man. It is a distinction made by the Creator Himself, stamped ineffaceably, not on the body only, but also on the soul and spirit; a distinction which no art, device, or practice can change or abolish. "*From the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.*" * The terms express a profound and sacred truth. To quote the words of a writer of our own day: "We are foolish, and without excuse foolish, in speaking of the superiority of one sex to the other, as if they could be compared in similar things. Each has what the other has not; each completes the other and is completed by the other; they are in nothing alike, and the happiness and perfection of both depends on each asking and receiving from the other what the other only can give." †

That there should be this diversity, original, radical, perpetual, is what we might have expected from study of the glorious works of the

* St. Mark 10 : 6.

† Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies*, Lecture II of Queen's Gardens, pp. 98, 99.

Lord. Throughout His universe are order and law. It is called, and beautifully, the Kosmos, a term implying the exquisite adaptation of parts to each other, a harmony resulting from variety of elements. Order is everywhere; everywhere law; and among the gravest of heresies is that known as syncretism; that into which men fall, who, failing to note the essential differences of things, would obliterate the lines by which God has brought order out of confusion, and smear and smudge the fairest pictures, putting everything out of place, and jumbling up all in confusion.

Among these distinctions are some which Nature herself preserves by laws against which it is useless for the human will to contend. But there are others which we may or may not respect; and in that case a bold will, or a maddened will, can work mischief. Where it depends on the intelligence and the will to keep things in their just order and place, the syncretist has his opportunity; he must be looked after lest he work confusion. He must be helped, in his better mood, by motives, or restrained, in his bad temper, by laws. That

Human Nature should remain perpetually distinct from that of the angel or the brute, is a thing to which the Creator attends without help from us. That the sexes, physically and anatomically considered, shall remain for ever unlike, is a thing past man's power to change. But there are other differences between the Man and the Woman, deeper than the surface; subtle, refined, delicate, and such that meddlers may throw them into disorder. Man and Woman are one flesh, yet diverse: a man has his thoughts, a woman hers; a man has his place, a woman hers; a man has his rights, work, and responsibilities, a woman has hers, and they are her own; neither has any business in the place of the other. This, however, is an order which, in their blindness or folly, they may fail to respect; one may usurp, the other may intrude. Therefore, it is right and necessary that they should be helped, or hindered; helped to keep things straight, prevented from making confusion. And this has been done for us, from age to age, by God, through laws and ordinances proper to that end. His voice has never ceased to sound in our ears the

warning, the exhortation which we need. His Church, in the old time and in the new, has ever taught, as a precept of religion, that the Man shall have his place, and the Woman hers, and that neither shall transgress what is seemly, nor vex the other, nor interfere unrighteously in the other's concerns.

There can be no doubt of this in the mind of any one who knows the rules and laws of the Ancient Church of God, and the canons and customs of the Holy Catholic Church of these latter days. In each dispensation, God forbade the mixing together what ought to be kept apart, the turning of order into confusion. His laws to that effect, in the old time, were most striking: "*Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with divers seeds: lest the fruit of thy seed which thou hast sown, and the fruit of thy vineyard, be defiled. Thou shalt not plow with an ass and an ox together. Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts, as of woolen and linen together.*" * These are instances of regulations, which, under an insignificant outward symbolism, indicate a Divine thought, a Divine purpose. But right

* Deuteronomy 22: 9-11.

to the point is this: "*The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God.*" * That a woman should dress as a man, and talk like a man, and act like a man, was abomination in the sight of Jehovah, because such proceedings would constitute a departure from her own place, and give a jar to the Kosmos of social propriety and the order of the world. The same principles hold good in the Christian commonwealth. The words of St. Paul, well known, and peculiarly aggravating to the ears of modern revolutionists, express the mind and will of the Catholic Church: "*I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. The head of every man is Christ; the head of the woman is the man. The man is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man.*" † With words like these you are familiar: you

* Deuteronomy 22: 5.

† 1 Tim. 2: 12, 13; 1 Cor. 11: 3, 7, 8.

know what they imply. Nor are they to be taken as the private opinion of one apostle; they express the mature and perpetual judgment of the Church, and the mind of God. That a woman should take the man's place; that she should aspire, *e. g.*, to Holy Orders, or preach, or minister in holy things in the Church, is, and always must be, foreign to the order of the Kingdom. And no doubt one reason why so many of the modern agitators for Woman's Rights, so called, are in the ranks of infidelity and free-thought, is this: that they know, and all the world knows, that the Church and the Bible are, and must always be, dead against them.

Note, then, these points: that the man and the woman are, beyond a certain point, utterly unlike; that there is a subtle, exquisite distinction between them; that God is its author; that it may be inferred from the order of the Universe and is one instance of that order; that to see and keep that distinction is essential to the well-being, happiness, and dignity of each; that self-will, pride, and folly may attempt to remove it; that God has, therefore,

helped us in our weakness and checked us in our folly, through the laws and canons of His Church, which witness perpetually for the truth, against the strife of tongues and the insubordination of the human will.

Since, then, these two beings exist, like yet unlike, each helpless without the other, our next question is, To what end were they created? Why, and for what, did God give them being? The story is clear and simple: they were made, first, to found and develop a race; they were made to form society.

Man was first. Then God said, Alone, he is good for nothing, incomplete, imperfect, useless. So, then, woman was made, to be with man. And that gave society, at once; society in fact, on a primitive scale, society in germ as we have it now.

When, therefore, the question is about the place and duties of the man or the woman in this world, the first point to settle is their relation to that visible organization called society, which they form, and with which their destinies are bound up. It is a practical question. Not in vague generalizations, not in the shadow-

land of dreams, not in ecstatic visions of the excited imagination, must we seek the answer to our question. Come down to fact and reality. The place of man, the place of woman, their duties, mission, rights, and powers, are to be determined simply by their relation in social life; they are members of well-defined organizations; of small organizations, first, of one larger organization of which the small one is the unit. They live, move, and have their being in society; and the last analysis of civilization is, not solitude, but a home.

Now, if the man and the woman exist to multiply and replenish the earth, blessed to that end by the primal benediction in the morning of the world, and if they are to form homes, out of which shall grow houses, tribes, states, and nations; and if, in designing them to that end, God made them essentially diverse the one from the other, establishing distinctions so obvious as to be immediately discerned, and so necessary that they have been maintained by many a law, human and divine, who can imagine that their work should be the same? The distinction, the difference, must

run through the entire line of their activity. A man must have his share, a woman hers; the woman was not made to do the man's work, nor the man that of the woman's. To see this is wisdom; to maintain it inflexibly is security and peace; to ignore it must end in destruction and unhappiness.

But here the question will be raised as to the place of woman in those organizations. What shall be said on that point? Is her position that of inferiority? Not at all. Some ill-mannered and bearish philosophers, indeed, instigated and encouraged by the dreadful mistakes made by women, have reviled and taunted them, as being, at best, only imperfect and miserable shadows of men. It is the fault of women, if man dare to use such language. Had they maintained their dignity and self-respect, had they stood where God put them, and not forced themselves into a ludicrous and unsuccessful rivalry with men, they might have been spared those taunts. Woman is not the inferior of man. There is no fair question of superiority or inferiority; it is idle, it is *un*philosophical, to raise it. In their own way,

each is both inferior and superior; the inferiority is no cause of shame, the superiority no ground for glorying. If man takes precedence in order, there are other respects in which woman is the superior of man. This would not have been disputed, had woman, thoroughly understanding her own position, maintained her honour and her glory, instead of waiving a good claim, and grasping at a false dignity and a tinsel crown.

Broadly it stands thus: Man's is the outer life, woman's the inner. No art or skill can change that relation to the world in which they live. To quote again: "The man's power is active, progressive, defensive. He is eminently the doer, the creator, the discoverer, the defender. His intellect is for speculation and invention; his energy for adventure, for war, and for conquest. . . . The man's work for his home is, to secure its maintenance, progress, and defence. The man's duty, as a member of the Commonwealth, is to assist in the maintenance, in the advance, in the defence of the State. The woman's duty, as a member of the Commonwealth, is to assist in the

ordering, in the comforting, and in the beautiful adornment of the State."*

The place and work of woman in this world are, then, a place and a work in a social life. And her place and work are not those of the man. His work lies outside, hers within. Without her, society could not have existed; without her, it cannot last. The fact, that in forming society, Man and Woman have distinct parts, implies this, that in maintaining and developing their work they shall continue to act in distinct relations to it. Something there shall be which man only can do; something which woman only can do. If she leave her own work and try to take up his, her work will remain undone; for man is not fool enough to try to do hers. And her work is inner, rather than outer; it runs in the line of ordering, comforting, and beautifying. Her place is in the Home, first, and then in general society; and these depend on her for a grace, a help, a harmony, a good ordering, which no one else can give.

These considerations give the turn to every

* 'Queen's Gardens,' pp. 120, 121.

thought of ours about woman's work. It is impossible for me to think of it at all, without first thinking of her place in the Home. That is her normal, primal seat: thence are derived all true conceptions of her rights, duty, and mission. I know the objections which will arise in your minds: that there are many women without homes or the means to make them; and again, that, as if by a bitter sarcasm of fate, the world of to-day is so changed that it often seems as if the woman must work the harder of the two in order to support the shiftless man. There are answers to these and similar objections: I shall try to give them by-and-by. But for the present I must leave the subject at this point, adding but one suggestion. I do this earnestly, seriously, and as one would speak of a matter of life or death. Let me then say, that whatever it be, in thought, deed, or will, that works among us now, to break up the Home, to make the Home-idea mean and contemptible in the eyes of woman, or to unfit her for domestic duties and disgust her with her proper work; whatever now acts on her high-wrought nature, her ambition, her

self-love, to turn her steps away from the Home-Life, and inflate her with visions of a career in the public places outside—this, whatever it be, is working against the best interests, the hope, the happiness of the human race. If, through ease, self-indulgence, and luxury, through curiosity of learning, through self-esteem and ambitious rivalry of man, a woman becomes disloyal to the home-idea, and despises it in her heart, she is, though perhaps unaware of the fact, helping others to upset the social order, and flout the wise Creator. She cannot elevate herself by departure from the line of truth and right; on the contrary, for her it is degradation. To push into the arena, and there to try a wrestling-match with men, is to descend from her throne, to tread her life down to the ground, and lay her honour in the dust.

The test and measure of a Christian woman is, whether, and to what extent, she is qualified to help, order, comfort, and adorn her home. And though there are instances in which women have done notable things outside, and things which have, in some degree, profited mankind, yet we have two things to say about them:

First, that they are exceptions. If it please Almighty God now and then to send into this world a woman with a virile spirit and some of a man's special gifts, so be it, and let us welcome the phenomenon and accept whatever may come to us by it, with thanks not unmixed with wonder. But, secondly, no exception can make a rule, and these *raræ aves* are no precedents, nor would average women gain by attempting to imitate them; for true it is, and ever shall be, that while men could have done, and shall continue to do, what these peculiar individuals did, and quite as well as they, or better, the converse is impossible; men never have done and never can do, what women can, for the blessing, enlightening, and purifying of society; and therefore society is poorer, not richer, for every woman who leaves off her own work, which no man can do for her, and turns her hand to something else which she was not made to do, and had better not have tried to do at all.

I measure the value of whatever is claimed by women or projected for them in these times,

by its tendency to confirm them in loyalty to God, and loyalty to the home-idea. On their fidelity to those two, depends the salvation of society. And of these two loyalties, supreme and ruling as is the first, even the second may avail to some extent, for a time, without the first. It is imaginable that a strong love for home, with its familiar traditions and its pure pleasures, may exist, even when God is not recognized in it; there are such cases, make of them what you will. In some instances, there are homes whose heads, now renegade, were born and bred Christians, and have in them still the lingering grace of a day which, alas! is dead. But where both these loyalties have died out, nothing can come but "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish." * A society which has neither faith in God nor defence for the home, is doomed to speedy destruction. And if women, who, having cast away their belief in the Supreme Being, and their reverence for the institutions of religion, have also ceased to care for or interest themselves in domestic life and home duties, should

* Romans 2 : 8, 9.

become the leaders of public opinion, and draw after them a following of able men who can show them how to carry out their schemes, the end of our civilization is not very far off. Such women as these merit the Scriptural epithet of *strange women ;* * strange to the race to which they belong, strange in thought, word, and act, estranged from the principles of religion, morals, and social science, they repeat the story of the primal sin, ever desiring an unblessed knowledge, and tempting men to taste it with them and discern its fruits; and men will follow them down, as Adam followed Eve, faithful to her in her shame as in her honour; they will follow them sadly and wonderingly, with dazed eyes and despairing heart, to a death from which there is no resurrection, to a night which has no morning beyond.

* *Mulieres extraneæ* as the Vulgate has it; *extra*, not *intra;* leading their life outside, in public; preaching haranguing, wanting to vote, to hold office ; the antipodes of St. Paul's Christian gentlewoman, who is discreet, sober-minded, and a keeper at home.

LECTURE II.

THE DEGRADATION OF WOMAN BY PAGANISM, AND HER RESTORATION BY CHRISTIANITY.

SOME years ago, in the course of my professional duties, I was brought into relations with a school for young women, in this city. Among the pupils were several bright and interesting girls, the daughters of as many prominent advocates of women's rights, or sympathizers with persons of that class. These girls kept somewhat apart, and, for their amusement, edited a little journal. Its articles related, chiefly, to the present degradation of woman and to the prospect of her glorious emancipation and advance; and it was called, either 'The Sun-Burst,' or 'The Dawn.' The thing was funny, at once, and piteous also: and that old recollection may serve as a text for my subject this evening,

which is, the Degradation of Woman by Paganism and her Restoration by Christianity.

If you are familiar with the writings and the thoughts of women of what are known as advanced ideas, you are aware how persistently they harp on the subject of the actual and present degradation of their sex. Well, let us take up that word, and hear another side of the subject. The degradation of woman was accomplished long ago, before Christ appeared on the earth. Her restoration and recovery were effected by Him, through His Incarnation, His Atonement, and the founding of "the Kingdom of Heaven." If since that day when her emancipation was substantially secured, she has remained in degradation, or has been enslaved again, it has been in regions where Christ has not yet been made known as Saviour and King, or when, having once known their Lord, men and women have forsaken Him, and gone back to the darkness out of which He drew them. This, then, is my thesis: that the elevation of Woman comes to her in and through Jesus Christ; that she is safe, so long as she remains loyal to Him; that

if there be at present any good cause for dissatisfaction with her circumstances and position, it is the result of departure from the principles of the Gospel and denial of the Christian faith. So that to speak of women who are enjoying what Jesus Christ secures to them in His Kingdom as degraded, is simply a perversion of the facts; while the sure way of bringing ruin on her head, and reducing her to a condition in which she might be truly described as degraded, would be, to induce her to adopt once more the old heathen notions, philosophical and religious, which made of her, in those past days, and would make of her in any day in which they should be accepted, a toy, a chattel, or a slave. Christ lifted her up; Christ holds her up to-day; and when, if ever, she lets go the hand of Christ, she will fall again into the mire and slough.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the particulars of the degradation of woman among the heathen. They are known too well, they have been too often recounted, to need restatement.* They

* See 'The Formation of Christianity,' by T. W. Allies, vol. ii. chap. vii.

came of want of knowledge of God as the Creator and Ruler of this world, of setting the creature in the place of the Creator, of walking by man's own light, of following man's own will. At the bottom of the horrid scene of disorder and distress presented in her melancholy annals, in those wretched days, was this idea: that man is the absolute superior of woman, and that she, his natural inferior, is to be used as a servant to do his work, as an instrument to give him pleasure, or as a necessary evil in order to continue the human race. High and honourable thought about woman had ceased. She was despised and rejected of men; her thoughts, her ideas, her fame, her very life, were held in contempt. Man sat on high, her absolute and brutal lord and despot. The system of polygamy completed her degradation; under it she appeared merely in a carnal and physical light; women were but serfs, or animals, kept in herds, more or less large, according to the means of the proprietor, for his use and pleasure. The idea of the inferiority of woman, physically and intellectually, was at the root of her suffering and deep

misery. History, so far as she is concerned, is all but a blank; in vain would you search there for the woman whom Christianity has created. Here and there some individuals appear, who, favoured by rank or unparalleled circumstances, rise above their fate, and win the respect or fear of men. But they are exceptions; the great mass lie in darkness and in the shadow of death. And the fairer and more beautiful the woman, the deeper was her degradation. Beauty, indeed, is a fatal dower. In Greece, material, physical beauty was the object of a general devotion amounting to worship; and yet it is true that no virtuous woman ever left a durable record on the pages of the history of Greece. An irreligious culture can but sink her deeper and deeper still.

In Israel there was a partial exception to the general condition to which I have referred. It was because the Jews, God's favoured people, had the relics of an old and pure tradition, and a clearer light. These, however, they obscured and defiled through the hardness of their hearts. Israel was lifted up, indeed, toward heaven by

the revelations under the patriarchs and the law; but Israel descended again toward the sides of the pit by revolt from God. The Jews were accused by Christ of having corrupted their sacred traditions, and departed from the ordinances of the Holy Ghost. God had created man in His own image; He had made them male and female; He had established monogamy as the law of their relationship; the family was to form the unit and basis of society, the tie of a pure and uncontaminated marriage was the bond to hold all things fast and safe. The Jews knew all that, but they could not bear it. One by one these root-principles were violated by the foisting in of a polygamy which God never blessed; by insisting on a privilege of divorce, of putting away one wife and taking another, which was merely suffered for the hardness of their hearts: "*Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so.*" * And yet, notwithstanding these aberrations, there remained enough light in their dwellings to enable God's

* S. Matt. 19 : 8.

ancient people to see the ideal of true and noble womanhood; the instances of virtuous women which the Greek annals nowhere afford are not wanting in the history of the Jewish race; the daughters of Zion must perforce be to some degree sheltered from the wild storm blowing elsewhere, considering what part one royal daughter among them had to take some day in the work of emancipating all mankind, unhelped by any man. But beyond that favoured realm the devil held sway. I need not speak, I could not decently speak, of the vileness of his works, nor depict the actual degradation of women under his terrific rule. The record includes not only the shocking items of polygamy, divorce, adultery, fornication, lasciviousness, lust, uncleanliness, with which society festered, as with ulcers from the crown of the head to the soles of the feet, but also the statutory enactments, the odious edicts, the godless laws, which protected crime and legalized the acts of human passion. Partly through the working of natural desire, unrestrained by the fear of God, and stimulated by false notions of life, and partly under a system

of studied affronts to God's Presence and rejection of His Sovereignty, woman was kept down under the ban, the victim of injustice and wrong. Only in Israel had she some defence; there only had she a hope, which hung before her eyes as a day-star on the curtain of a night about to pass away. Every faithful daughter of Israel hoped that she might be a mother; and every mother, bending with rapture over her first-born son, thought it possible that she held in her arms the Christ that was to be.

And how was woman lifted up? And how did she come to that which she now is? Is there a woman's heart here present that does not beat faster as she thinks of that wondrous history? Let us say at once, and challenge disproof of our assertion, that the restoration and exaltation of woman came through the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ. That she should be the first to receive the blessing and grace which flow from that redemption, is most just and right, since it is to her, under the power of the Holy Ghost, to her alone, to her in her maiden purity and

in her virgin solitude, that the world owes the birth of its Saviour.

Let no one think that Almighty God was limited to one way of saving the human race. He might have done it by any other agency than that which he employed—by sending us some deliverer born in the natural order and in the common way. He chose, however, one way and a marvellous one. He sent forth His Son, born of a woman; nay, not merely born, but "*made of a woman;*" * not of men, neither by man, but by woman did this deliverance come. It is a point of immense significance. Not by the proud, haughty, and domineering man is help brought to us: he must stand aside; he is not wanted there; he shall have no part nor lot in it. What comes, in that hour of deep darkness, shall come through the despised sex. That is the burden of the sublimest of all hymns ever inspired by the Holy Ghost—the hymn that Mary sang, when she knew what Cod was to work through her; the hymn which has formed ever since the Evening Song of the redeemed world. In the "MAGNIFICAT"

* Galatians 4: 4.

we hear the woman's voice, now no more despised and set at nought, but crowned in her regal honour. The motive of that glorious canticle is the overthrow of the proud, the exaltation of the contemned. The woman is that one of low degree whom God hath exalted; the lordly man is the mighty whom God hath put down from his seat. The woman is the poor and hungry whom God hath filled with good things; He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden, and, behold, from thenceforth all generations shall call her blessed.

But there is much more here; there is a truth which you cannot too carefully note. The redemption of mankind comes by the woman, not only since Christ was born of her, but also (and especially notable is this) because the essential characteristic qualities of the woman have been consecrated and made the instruments of purification and deliverance. The strong qualities, the heathen virtues, the mannish characteristics—these are all quietly set aside; a new world is to be made, by means which men would have laughed at; a

revolution is coming through agencies which men despised as belonging to what they held in contempt as the weaker sex. I could not express this in any words of mine as strongly, as clearly, as it was expressed in a noble sermon preached before our last Diocesan Convention. I will quote the writer's words in this place, and take them in as part of my argument:

"When we affirm that Jesus was not only born, but made of a woman, we mean to say that it was the virtues of the woman, not the powers of the man, which the economy of the Incarnation consecrated to be the weapons of spiritual victory. The Son of Mary, in other words, came to redeem the world, not after the fashion of the pagan Hercules, by the manifestations of power or of might. It was not through physical prowess in a succession of twelve labours that He cleaned out the Augean stable. But how? He stooped to conquer. He abhorred not the Virgin's womb. It was by His meekness in the bearing of the wrong; it was by His patience; it was by His gentleness; it was by His goodness; it was by His long-suffering; it was by His obedient self-

surrender; it was by His self-sacrifice even unto death—the death of a slave upon a malefactor's cross—that Jesus overcame the evil that was in the world, and, in triumphing over it, won men back again to the love of goodness and of God. But meekness, patience, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, obedient self-surrender, lowly self-sacrifice—these are the virtues of which the woman, not the man, is the exemplar and the type. It was these virtues which Jesus, in the economy of the Incarnation, raised to a position of moral supremacy unknown in the history of the world before; and by making them, in a peculiar sense, His own, won for woman the position which she holds to-day in every Christian land. We claim, then, and we desire to have the distinctive nature of our claim clearly understood—we claim that Christianity, by virtue of a mysterious divine economy peculiar to itself, has been the means of introducing a new moral order into the world, and that, too, our enemies themselves being witness: 'In antiquity,' says Mr. Lecky, 'the virtues that were most admired were always those which were distinctly

masculine. None of the virtues that were highly prized were virtues distinctly or pre-eminently feminine.' To Christianity we owe it that we have all been taught that greatest of all moral lessons—best and greatest in its practical application to the manifold relations of life—the lesson that it is not by force, it is not by might, it is not by the arbitrary exercise of a sovereign will, it is not by the maintenance of law as the guardian of right, that the evil is at last to be overcome, and the love of goodness enthroned in the hearts of men. At home, abroad, in the rush of business, or ministering at the altar, it is by the enduring of the wrong in the spirit of meekness; it is by patience and long-suffering, as an atonement for self-will in the past; it is by lowly ministries of love and self-sacrifice, as a corrective for pride and self-indulgence, that the enmity of the natural heart is to be overcome, and the rule of Satan broken in the seat of its power. Meekness, patience, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, self-sacrifice, let it again be repeated, brethren, are no mere accidents of Christianity; they are of its very essence; they were present at its birth; it

sucked them from the breasts when, in the person of its adorable Lord, it drew its inspiration from the life, and was cradled into being by the ministry of her whom all generations unite in calling blessed."*

Yes, it is true, most true, as the eloquent preacher whom I have quoted has said. The world has been remade, rebuilt, transformed, through the Incarnation of the Son of God; and, as He was made of a woman, so was woman brought up by Him out of the deep places of her old misery, and placed on high, the object of the love, the reverence, the gratitude of men.

Think what her Lord has done for her, in return for her sweet submission to His will. "*Ecce Ancilla Domini*," she said; "behold the Handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy will." Thus did she accept her mission with the humiliation, the misunderstanding, the reproach, which she foresaw,

* *The Redemption of the Creature.* A Sermon preached before the Annual Convention of the Diocese of New York, 1882. By the Rev. Thomas Richey, D.D., St. Mark's in the Bowery, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, General Theological Seminary. James Pott, publisher.

receiving as her reward not only the redemption of her companion, but the elevation of her own sex. Side by side with the progress of the Christian faith over the earth has come the rescue, the restoration of woman. It is as clear to-day as ever: in Christian lands only, in those which Christianity has formed, she is free; elsewhere, she is still degraded and enslaved, standing, or rather crouching down, to-day, in India, in China, in the islands of the sea, in every land which the Gospel has not enlightened, precisely as she was eighteen hundred years ago in the old days of her pagan bondage. Christianity has saved her. It has restored Holy Matrimony, the union of one man and one woman for life, under a sacramental seal, and with the solemn warning, "*Those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.*" It has thus rebuilt the Altar of Home, which was broken down; it has made new homes, bright and beautiful with the reflected light of the Holy House of Nazareth and Bethlehem. It has reaffirmed the old patriarchal principle, in declaring that Christ's people are a holy priesthood, in making

every father the head of his own house, to lead them to God by example, by precept, and by his divinely delegated authority. Thus restoring Holy Matrimony, and thus reconstructing the Home, Christianity has broken the woman's fetters, for it is not possible that a Christian wife, a Christian mother, true to God and to herself, should be mistaken any longer for a slave, or denied that honour which is her due. And from the home thus sanctified, purified, and rebuilt, has been developed a social order, a commonwealth, having in itself the salt to save it from corruption, the elements of calmness, stability, and peace; an order in which woman is respected and held in honour; in which her influence, already great, is growing; in which she enjoys a security, a consideration, such as she never had before; in which every natural right is recognized and maintained; in which she, who once was despised, now rules, in her proper sphere, over men. Wherever Christian ideas and Christian principles are welcomed and lived out, woman has all of honour and exaltation and glory that she can legitimately have, and more than she

knows what to do with. What are they but wilfully blind who fail to see this? or what but morbid and mistaken who at this hour, and under the full sunshine of this high noon of her transfiguration, ask for more rights and powers than she already enjoys?

Let us not stop here: let us take the reverse of the picture. Christianity has exalted woman. Should Christianity lose its power, she would be again degraded, and turned back into her old place. No moral or spiritual force, excepting that of the Holy Ghost, ever yet did aught for her; and if, in a fatal hour, she should forget this, or think to do without that aid, or turn to other helpers, she is lost again, and lost beyond recovery.

O Christian women, hear the word of the Lord! The history of your sex ought to make you loyal, even with a passionate loyalty, to Christ and his Church. To Him, your Redeemer, and, through one of yourselves, the Redeemer of the world, you owe everything which you now enjoy. You, then, should be true to Him, as the needle is true to the pole, as the loving soul to the worthy object of its

affection, as the Bride to him of whom she knows that he is hers for ever. It is your mission to keep your faith to Him unspotted, and then to keep men up to their duty to Him. Talk of rights! talk of a mission!—here, surely, is a mission worthy of yourselves, and only to be fulfilled by superhuman efforts: to be the salt of the age, to be as a light of the world. You have the power; you have the gifts required. Men are *not* your superiors; they are inferiors to you in more ways than one, and notably in their lethargy of spirit, in their indifference to religion, in their dulness of appreciation of higher truths. Here is a mission for you, one strictly in the line of your own progress: to put forth your moral and spiritual strength to draw men back from the paths of their wandering from God, and to mantain in the community the principles of the doctrine of Christ. Remember your work: to order, to comfort, to adorn; to order your own lives after the laws of God and the precepts of religion; to comfort those who sometimes are ready to despair of virtue, honour, and immortality, by your own sweet and persuasive words; to adorn

the domestic and social circle by the fruit of your active hands and the works of your praise.

We hear much said about the degradation of women: some of it is true. Woman is degraded; there is danger that the degradation may go on. But the real degradation is not where they bid us look for it. Rather may it be seen wherever the old history has been forgotten, and where the instruments which saved her once have been thrown away. Hand in hand with her alienation from Christ goes on the degradation of His recreant daughter. She of whom the world's Redeemer was born, was pledged, for ever, by the fact of that Maternity, to aid in carrying forward the work; she should be, in all ages, the co-worker with God in keeping up the Christian faith, the Christian institutions, the love of Christ. But she leaves all that; she forgets; she falls away. The story of Eden and the fatal Garden is told over and over again. Satan comes to her, whispering in her ear; whispering always, of knowledge; of more knowledge; of the knowledge of good and evil—whispering that nothing can be gained by simply standing fast and believing in God.

Woman becomes imbued, either with false and miserable scepticisms, or with low passions; she degrades herself, by ministering to her own vanity and to the lusts and pleasures of sinful men, or, worse, by forgetting, or trying to forget, and teaching others to forget, the rudiments, the first principles, of that divinely taught science which makes her position, relatively to man, secure. This second lapse is, on the whole, worse than the former; it brings on her a swifter, a surer degradation. It is degradation for a woman to lead a mere animal life; to spend her days in idleness and pleasure; to display her beauty—if perchance she have any—as a sight to the eager public gaze; to give her whole mind—or whatever goes by that name—to dress, amusement, and the frivolities of society; to live without God, helping and blessing no human being. This is indeed a deep descent; but there is a more emphatic, a more hopeless degradation for her. It is seen, when she seeks to reverse the laws of her nature, and upset the economy of the universe, by pushing her way out of her own sphere and entering into a rivalry with men in *their* sphere

and in *their* proper pursuits. On that must follow a degradation justly to be feared. When the clamour for rights appears to be taking the form of a competition with men on a field which God has reserved for men only, in work not suited to the woman, and in professions already overstocked; that must end, not in enhancing the merit of woman in his eyes, but in making her offensive and detestable. There is a point beyond which patience will not hold out; and of this let the woman be sure, that if she go too far the end will come, and men, having long borne her manners, and finding that she is becoming a social nuisance and a general tormentor, will finally lose all respect for her, and thrust her away with loathing and disgust, and bid her behave herself and go back to her old inferiority. This also is of logical necessity. For God meant woman to humanize, soften, and sweetly govern man; and she can do it, if she does it as God wills and with the helps which He provides. But if she fail, and man finds himself practically alone in the world, without the help which God intended that he should get from the woman,

and which he can get nowhere else on earth, the end must be, that he himself will become a brute again, and the first victim will be the misguided cause of his own mental and moral deterioration.

I tell you, Christian women, your work, your mission, are on Christian lines, in Christian institutions, and under the inspiration of Christian ideas. There you can do good work: you are not needed elsewhere, except to help us to stem the flood which aims at sweeping Christ and the Church away. You can do no real good, on the lines on which the fanatics and the antichrists are so active. I believe you know it, as well as I do. I believe—not to believe it would be next door to despair—that the majority, the vast majority of Christian women all through the land, quiet, thoughtful, are not in sympathy with the few who make most of the noise about us; that they disown them, detest them, and revolt from their arts and practices. Be true to the past, to the present; be true to the instincts of real women; be loyal to Him who hath exalted you. And if, at times, you are lured and tempted, by

the voices of the age, or tired of the incessant drumming for attention, and the unseemly actions of some of your sex, and feel as if you needed something to clear the thoughts and purify the intention, let me tell you what to do. Go to some church, at evening, where they sing the "Magnificat," and listen; and in that anthem hear the heavens telling the true, and only true, story of your sex's honour, and the sources of your strength. And be this your test of yourselves; that you can take in the words with your whole heart, and feel that what you hear you do from the heart believe. If you be true women, you can also say to God:

"MY SOUL DOTH MAGNIFY THE LORD; AND MY SPIRIT HATH REJOICED IN GOD MY SAVIOUR.

"FOR HE HATH REGARDED THE LOWLINESS OF HIS HANDMAIDEN.

"FOR HE THAT IS MIGHTY HATH MAGNIFIED ME: AND HOLY IS HIS NAME.

"AND HIS MERCY IS ON THEM THAT FEAR HIM FROM GENERATION TO GENERATION."

So long as the Gospel shall be preached, so long as Christ shall be worshipped as the

Saviour of the world, so long shall this most lovely of the Evangelical Hymns declare to women the story of their exaltation and the way of maintaining their influence and their honour among us. The Song of the Blessed Mother of God is, from age to age, a mirror into which woman may look, and see with the eyes of the spirit the mystery and the glory of her sex. And blessed are the eyes that see those wonders of redemption!

Remember: woman owes to Christianity whatever of power and honour she enjoys. She bore in her bosom the Hope of all the ends of the earth; she stands or falls now by her loyalty to Him. Her mission is not yet ended; it lasts on and on; it is that of holding up before us in her arms the Incarnate God, by maintaining among us the knowledge of the truth, the religious ideal, the sweetness and beauty of heaven, the Godlikeness in humanity. None can do this thoroughly well but those who love their Lord; who count all other loves inferior to that which they bear to Him; who are ready to make the sacrifice which consecrates them for ever to His cause. Such as these

shall be hereafter, as thus far, the salt of the earth, a joy and crown of rejoicing among us; and of every such woman, whatever her rank or station in this world, the man may say, as he recalls the noble description of her in the Book of Proverbs, that

"*She shall do him good, and not evil, all the days of her life.*"

LECTURE III.

THE EDUCATION OF WOMAN FOR HER WORK.

IN beginning this evening's lecture, let me connect it by a word or two with those already given. 1. We considered the place of woman in the world, showing that she has her own sphere and mission, and that they are not those of the man; that the man and the woman differ so greatly that one might say that they are in nothing the same; and that what comes to the world through woman, in comfort and help, can be had in no way except through her. 2. We considered how she has been lifted up by Christianity, and transferred from the place of slave and chattel to that of a power in social life and a blessing to mankind; that her mission is on Christian lines, and is to be fulfilled

in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

It is now in order to speak of her training for her work; that is my subject this evening. And it is clear that the view which one takes of the education of women must be governed by his convictions, if he has such, respecting her place in the universe and the design of her creation.

No one present needs to be reminded that the subject of the education of women has of late been much discussed among us. It has not only been discussed, it has been, to use the term so dear to a certain class, agitated. The newspapers have teemed with articles about it; reporters have besieged prominent men for their views on it; at least one public meeting has been held to make or direct opinion on the subject. Nor here alone, but elsewhere, has it been raised into what is called a living issue of the day. Among the sounds which reach our ears from the sources and organs of this hubbub, two words especially are audible—*Higher Education* and *Co-education.* I shall take these catch-words as field-marks for a brief survey of the ground of the strife.

"*The Higher Education of Women.*" The phrase is sweetly innocent. Abstractly, who could object to higher education for women, or men, or anything capable of being taught? But, come to think about it, and inquire what it means, and the phrase assumes a dubious air. "The *Higher* Education of Women?" What is meant by this? The comparative degree suggests a question: Higher than what? Higher than whose? Higher than that of men? Or higher than that which women receive at present? Somewhat confused by a vague term which does not explain itself, one asks the prominent advocates of this so-called higher education what they mean, and it appears as the result that many of those who use it have ideas not necessarily conveyed by the word itself, and that a term so innocent, so harmless that no one would think of objecting to it, may be used to mask certain theories about the education of women, against which the speaker, for one, deems it his duty to enter a solemn protest.

Some of the advocates of this higher education desire that men and women should be

trained on the same line. Their idea is to obliterate distinctions as far as possible, throw the young of both sexes together, give them the same intellectual discipline, and teach the women to think men's thoughts and do men's work. That this is the higher education favoured by no inconsiderable number in our day, is clear, from the fact that they demand what is known by the term—which I ask your pardon for using here—Co-education. By co-education is meant, not only that the youth of both sexes should be taught the very same things, but that they should be taught in the same places, and out of the same books, and by the same teachers, and in the company of each other. It is alleged that this is the simple and natural course; that no inconveniences can arise from it; that great benefits will accrue to both sexes from their being thus thrown together in the class-room and the lecture-room. Nor is this held as theory only; it is now in practice, in this country and in Europe. Its results are lauded to the skies; it is hailed as a great step forward in human progress; while persons with old-fashioned views are bantered for their

timidity, and urged to lay aside their prejudices and take their places among the patrons of this charming system, in which the gentlest maiden shall take no harm, while the lion-like youth shall come to "roar you like a sucking dove." Obviously this is a notable invention; one of the most notable of the age. Why should not its apostles be eager for its general acceptance?

Now, this is what some persons are driving at under the innocent phrase of higher education. They aim at treating girls and boys, young men and young women, as if they were substantially one and the same creature, and training them together on that theory; saying that the sex-difference will by a kind of innate power take care of itself, and that we may proceed without regarding it, save in so far as propriety and good-breeding require. I need hardly remind you how well this falls in with certain other movements, that in favour of female suffrage, for example, and other designs of those who clamour for woman's rights. I would not say that the advocates of this system of education approve of the fantastic proceedings referred to; but I do say and

claim that these views on education work inevitably in the same direction; that they are aiding in that disintegration of the social system which is going on before our eyes at an alarming rate. It is indeed a part of the baleful progress of the age, to insist that every barrier between the sexes should be removed as fast as possible. It is claimed that our youth should be thrown together as much as possible; that young women ought to know all that young men know; that they should not be afraid to look at anything that a man may look at; to hear what, in old times, would not have been spoken in a woman's presence; to go with men wherever men go; to read whatever men read, and talk of it with men. I know that this is claimed to-day, and by persons of irreproachable morals and orderly behaviour; I know that mothers who would shield their daughters from such complete partnership in the thoughts and life of their friends of the other sex are remonstrated with as behind the age and at war with its spirit. And I ask how such theories of life could be more vigorously helped forward than by the

system of co-education? "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." The rule is a good one; it may be applied in more ways than one. There is another old saying, which ought to be remembered here: "Familiarity is certain to breed contempt."

Now the question is: Ought this kind of education, this sexless teaching, to be spoken of as a higher teaching? Would it elevate? or would it degrade? Would it bless? or would it curse?

What is Education? On that point, at least, we have learned something. Education is not the cramming the mind with facts; it is not the stuffing the memory with things in text-books. In Paris they have a process for fattening poultry by artificial means; it is called "*engraissement mécanique*," and consists in thrusting food down the throats of the poor creatures, who meanwhile are so fastened that they can neither escape nor resist. In the old methods of education there was a resemblance to that; but men have learned "a more excellent way." They know that education, rightly

understood, proceeds rather from within than from without. It means the development of powers and gifts of God already in the child; the drawing out intellectual and moral force and teaching it the best means of application; the cultivation of the physical, also, that it may be a strong, healthful, and competent vehicle for the spiritual. To evolve, to develop, to educe, an immortal intelligence; to fit a personal, moral agent to do his duty in that state of life to which he has been called: this is Education.

But the question comes up, instantly: What is that state of life? what is the position of that agent? what is the nature to be thus trained? If Education be no mere mechanical process, but the nobler work which I have described, then must the teacher know the character, the being for whose training he is responsible. And if he have two beings to train, his first duty is to know whether they differ, and how. And if these two beings differ widely; if God has given them different places in His world, and different missions, and to each a distinct and complete furniture of abilities, qualities,

endowments, intended to produce such exquisite harmony as is made by divers notes drawn from divers strings—the work of education must begin with a reverent recognition of these distinctions. And we claim that there is precisely that difference between the sexes; and that it is innate, and divinely-ordered; and therefore we go on, and hold that the work of education demands not only learning, skill, pains, and aptness to teach, but also, and before all these, a power of discriminating between things unlike, and a most devout and religious recognition of the profound, the immense, the impassable distance between the sexes, as fixed by the act of the Creator and secured by natural laws which cannot be broken with impunity.

Therefore, on theory, first, and on the principles enunciated already and not needing repetition, we protest against the system of co-education as mischievous. The sexes ought not to be educated together, unless all distinction between them be abolished; and, if those distinctions cannot be abolished, it is mere quackery to try to educate them on the same line. The man and the woman have not the

same destiny, nor the same duties. The man must be trained in view of the line which he is to take outward; the woman for duties in another direction. What is best for him is not best for her; what she needs is useless to him.

And, secondly, as a practical question, we hold it to be radically wrong. Nature herself forbids co-education and protests against it. There are physical reasons for not subjecting growing girls to a pressure which young men easily endure. There are social reasons for not throwing young men and young women together at an age when the passions are strong and the interest in each other is inevitable.*

* It is very difficult to get at the facts about co-education as now existing; reports seem to vary according to the prejudices of those who give their testimony. I have heard enough, however, from good sources, to make me extremely suspicious of the loud eulogies of the system so often heard. Gentlemen of the medical profession, whose names are a guarantee of their good judgment and impartiality, have assured me that the female constitution cannot sustain, and does not sustain, without injury, the strain which is put upon it in the mixed colleges. Others tell me, on testimony *ab intra*—and students often know more than their teachers about what is going on among themselves—that moral as well as physical deterioration is no strange phenomenon. A friend of mine saw, at Zurich in Switzerland, young women walking about in trousers, smoking cigarettes, and chatting

There are domestic reasons for not exposing girls to the gaze and scrutiny of young men, a large part of whom are bent much more on amusement than on hard study; decency, propriety, and delicacy demand for the maiden the protection of her mother's presence. I attach little value to the testimony borne by enthusiasts to the harmlessness of the system, as now in practical working in certain places; there is evidence quite as clear to the contrary, which, however, it would be indiscreet to produce. But let the thing go on, and time, we think, will justify the prediction, that the entrance of

with the professors; they were medical students. An eye-witness told me that he saw young girls parading on the *campus* of a Western college with the sophomoric "banger" grasped in the hand. If the reader be minded to enjoy a little pleasantry, let him read the following extract from a letter from a schoolboy just handed to me. This enthusiastic young co-educationist, having lately been transferred from Racine College to another "seminary of learning," writes thus: "The school I go to now is a *dandy* one. Girls go to this school as well as boys; and we have a *bully* time at a party every Friday evening, playing kissing games with 'em." By-the-way, a friend suggested the other day, in a letter, that the advocates of co-education ought now to turn their hand to another task, and petition the trustees of Vassar and Wellesley to receive a few young men into those institutions.

Athene into our collegiate halls will be inevitably followed by the advent of Aphrodite.

Indeed, there is a fallacy in the very speech of those who annoy us with the agitation of this question. It is assumed that a higher education for the girl must be an education the same that her brother gets. Look at the juggle in the words. Let us drop the terms *higher* and *lower* and take a better one, *equal.* Here, for example, is a father who has two children, a boy and a girl. He loves them both alike, he wishes to do the best for each that he can. Let him stop his ears to delusive talk about "higher" and "lower"—let him understand just what he wants. He wants his daughter to be as well educated as his son: he is right so far. But he does not mean that his daughter shall be educated exactly like his son. If he did, he would, in my opinion, deserve to be stamped as a fool. If he knows anything about his children, he knows that they were born into this world as different as they could be; he has noted, he has been amazed at the signs of their total unlikeness, in certain respects, to each other. He cannot dream of

training them exactly alike: there would be no more sense in educating his girl on his boy's line, than the boy on the girl's line: and if either is to find in after-life the highest earthly happiness in a marriage sanctified by the benediction of God, and a home built on the foundation of truth, honour, and love, it will be through union with a companion trained under totally different conditions. Each of these children must be educated; each equally well. The father can no more be unjust to the little daughter than to her brother. Equally good education must they have; else he is unrighteous and unjust. But the same, they cannot have; else he is a theorist, and has lost common sense. That is the point to keep in mind. Equally well must the young men and maidens be taught; but in the same way, and on the same principles and system, and as if there were one and the same future for each? God forbid!

Now, this is the only way in which the harmony of the sexes is to be maintained; in which they are to be made the complement of each other; in which the woman shall be

enabled to be to the man all that he needs, while he shall hold her in the honour and devotion which are her due. To preserve, throughout, the distinctions made by God, is the first of all sound canons of education. And the opinion is a general one, that this is justified in the results, and that a woman taken out of her place and trained among men and as a man would not be an object which man can admire or love. The specimens produced by that rude, barbarian culture repel us. What are called "professional beauties" are, as a class, held in contempt: for who degrades herself more shamelessly than she who parades her corporal advantages, and lives on the admiration excited by a *physique* which disease and decay shall soon transform to a hideous wreck, and on which the worm shall presently be feeding? But there is another and a true beauty, a very excellent womanliness, perhaps made up in part of the exterior ornamental work of material and physical charms, but consisting essentially of an interior loveliness: the light of a true woman-spirit and woman-soul is precious to the eyes; her influence is among

the most powerful of moral levers; again and again has it proved the salvation of men in peril. But if, by some wrong system of training, the woman, such as God meant her to be, and as she is portrayed in the *Magnificat*, should have vanished away; and the spirit which surveys you from the eyes of the woman is one from which a woman's thought, a woman's faith, a woman's tenderness have flown; and in place of these you trace the virile tone, and something of the hardness, boldness, grossness, of us forlorn men; when, in short, a man's soul seems to be staring at you, domineeringly or insultingly, from what seems to be a woman's forehead; that is the sign of a loss to us and the world, never to be sufficiently deplored. The subject is not to be treated lightly; it is a terrible theme. Persons may be met in the highways of life who illustrate what I say: their aspect is formidable; the beauty, the grace, are fled; strident, dogmatic, knagging, they constitute the worst of all imaginable social trials, and are disgusting to the average man. And why? It is no accident: such a personage as this is in herself

the sign and instance of unfitness, a thing that ought not to be; one not herself, but disguised as some one else, masquerading in the carnival of this troubled life, and leaving behind her a place that is empty, and duties which are not fulfilled.

We deny, therefore, that it is right to educate young men and young women together; we regard it as the suggestion of theorists who, in following their favourite ideas, have lost sight of the laws of Nature and the ordinances of God and the Church. Shall we, then, declare ourselves opposed to the higher education of women? Again I say that it is better to drop a dubious phrase, a phrase that has no exact meaning; to raise no question about degrees, to institute no comparisons. If by higher education you mean that women are to be trained and taught in the same way as men, we oppose it as a folly and a fraud. But if by higher education you mean that they shall receive an education equally good, equally practical, and the best that they can have, and meanwhile be taught and trained as women and not as men, and to do a woman's work,

and to fulfil a woman's mission in a woman's proper place, then we say Amen, with all the heart. But what is high education in that sense of the term? Let us consider.

It is that education which develops the true ideal of womanhood, as distinct from that of manhood; an education which gives the best type of the woman; which blesses and comforts social life with the boon of real women, such as God meant them to be, and not with poor imitations of men; an education which holds them in their proper place, and fits them to act, thence, with power on the world. Such an education should aim at the development of the most perfect *physique* and the most thorough intellectual culture. It should begin with the youngest pupils in the school, and fit each for her proper duty and work, whatever that may be. Girls to whom the way lies open for more than the average culture, should have facilities for its attainment. To the rarer spirits, should be opened all the treasures of literature, art, and science; it should make them thorough scholars, accomplished women, able to hold their own with the wisest and the

most learned of the age. Yet this education should have for its final aim the fitting woman for her own place in the Kosmos. And that, we have already defined to be a place in the home, and in a social order which is built on the idea of the home, and is in fact but an extension, an expansion of the home. Let the young woman learn all that she can, and grow in knowledge; yet let her remember her first, her sacred duty: to qualify herself for the rule of her own little realm; to know the art of keeping it in order, of governing it prudently with all her power, of making it, in the eyes of the man, the most attractive place on earth, the abode of sincerity, purity, and truth.

The education of the average woman should be, first, an education for home-life and home-duties. It depends on her social position how far that shall go. Social inequality is the law of this present world; it always has been, it always must be; the alternative is communism, which means a reign of terror ending in chaos. As many different social grades as there be, so many are the homes: let the woman be trained, first, so as to be true to her home, and able to

make of it all that it is capable of being. Here is scope for every variety and grade of culture; in God's eye all homes, from the highest to the humblest, are sacred. If man be the bread-winner, woman is the home-maker. She should know the home-science from beginning to end. The home is the divinely-founded institution for continuing the human race; the sanctuary of chastity and love; the school of sweet and valuable discipline; the theatre of religious, moral, and social duty; the predestination of the children. Shame on the woman who calls any education *higher* than that which qualifies her for her place as regent in such a domain! Let her, first, be taught her duties in that hallowed place. And then, if for any reason she must live outside of its protection, yet even so she should be true to herself, and try to help forward in some way the home-idea. It cannot be her duty to go down and strive in the streets, to vote, to fight, to act the man; wherever her lot may be cast, she is bound to be using her matchless powers in maintaining the common faith in principles on which the safety and prosperity of the nation depend.

Several thoughts may arise in your minds by way of objection to my line of argument; let me try to divine some of them.

First, you may have said to yourselves that you know cases in which the woman is compelled to maintain her home by her own exertions. Very true; and in that case let her go outside and earn a living and provide bread for her own. Who would say that women should be hindered from any honest industry becoming their sex? Nay, rather would I have every girl, even those of the wealthiest families, taught some art, trade, or "mystery" (as they call it in the indentures), by which, in case of sudden reverse of fortune, so common here, she might be able to support herself and those dependent on her. Let no kind of work be denied her which it is womanly to perform; and more, let the men whom we sometimes see engaged in work which women could do better, be sent about their business, and put to something beseeming the man.

Again, you may have thought, where time is spent entirely in household and domestic duties, none is left for the woman who would

read, study, and devote herself to literature and science. What, then, shall she do? Go on all her life in that narrow round, and never come to wider things? It is the old question of duty again—of duty and privilege. She who has done her duty well may joyfully take her diversion afterward; and women, rightly minded, will find time for a brisk range through broader fields, thence to return refreshed and enriched. There are good housewives and devoted mothers who add to their knowledge of the home-science great store of culture drawn from the world's treasure-houses, and thus are fitted to be the intelligent companion of the husband, the large-minded and liberal moulder and trainer of the children. We rejoice in cases of this kind: only we say that these things should follow after higher and more sacred duties; that they are not to be sought for themselves; that they are to be had and enjoyed only where no mission has been neglected, and no proper and necessary work has been left undone.

But, finally, it will be said that many women have no homes. That is true; yet they are

exceptions, and their unhappy case makes not against the general line of our argument. But are they, indeed, so numerous, these women absolutely without homes, and thus insensible to the invitation to the performance of home-duties? I think not. I think that almost every woman you could name is connected with some home, either as the head of a family or as a member thereof, or as in some way a recipient of its benefits. There may be exceptions; but they prove nothing against the law which assigns to woman as her chief duty that of bearing and rearing men, and makes the home the basis and beginning of society, and the Christian home the basis of Christian civilization.* I believe this to be demonstrably

* "From the earliest records of mankind down to this moment, in every race and every form or degree of civilization or barbarism, the relative position of the sexes has been essentially the same, with exceptions so feeble, rare, and transient that they only prove the rule. Such permanence in the foundation of society, while all that rests upon it has passed from change to change, is proof in itself that this foundation lies deep in the essential nature of things. It is idle to prate of the old time that has passed away and the new time that is coming. The 'new time' can no more stir the basis of human nature than it can stop the movement of the earth.

true; and that on the loss of truth on this subject, and on the general breaking up of the Christian home, must follow the collapse of Christian institutions and modern civilization.*

"The cause of this permanence is obvious. Women have great special tasks assigned them in the work of life, and men have not. To these tasks their whole nature, moral and physical, is adjusted. There is scarcely a distinctive quality of women that has not a direct or indirect bearing upon them. Everything else in their existence is subordinated to the indispensable functions of continuing and rearing the human race; and, during the best years of life, this work, fully discharged, leaves little room for any other. Rightly considered, it is a work no less dignified than essential. It is the root and stem of national existence, while the occupations of men are but the leaves and branches. On women of the intelligent and instructed classes depends the future of the nation. If they are sound in body and mind, impart this soundness to a numerous offspring, and rear them to a sense of responsibility and duty, there are no national evils that we cannot overcome. If they fail to do this their part, then the masses of the coarse and unintelligent, always of rapid increase, will overwhelm us and our institutions. When these indispensable duties are fully discharged, then the suffrage agitators may ask with better grace, if not with more reason, that they may share the political functions of men."—*Some of the Reasons against Woman Suffrage*, by FRANCIS PARKMAN. Boston. Printed at the request of an association of women.

* "The Family is the most important question confronting the people to-day. This is the opinion of such men as ex-President L. Woolsey, of Yale; Elisha Mulford, the author and thinker on social problems; and Professor Dwight, of the Columbia Law School. The Divorce Reform League,

I shall endeavour to show hereafter how the home is menaced with destruction, and what processes are now at work to undermine it. But, in concluding this lecture, let me say two things, and leave them for your thoughts.

The first is this: that if ever the present system of things shall have passed away, amid strife, bloodshed, anarchy, and revolution more horrible than any which the world has yet seen, it will be because the home has ceased to be reverenced and defended, as the fountain of civilization.

And the second is this: that we have not in society to-day a more dangerous public enemy than the woman who, under the selfish idea of lifting herself up into a higher intellectual position, deliberately unfits herself for social and domestic duties, and persuades others to follow that example, and to make of themselves such characters that no home could be brighter, better, or happier for their presence; nay, more, that no home could hold them.

which I represent, appeals to all who would maintain this purity of the home, whether or not they would go as far as some in the restraints upon divorce."—*Rev. Samuel W. Dike.*

There are all types of womanhood among us, some of them most wretched: there are vain, frivolous, foolish women; women who live with no high object, but merely for amusement and pleasure; women who, though they have homes, break them up by their unconquerable folly or their wayward lives; who are neither true wives to their husbands nor true mothers to their children. These do harm enough; no tongue can tell the mischief wrought by them. But worse by far is she who kills the home-idea in cold blood, and holds such views of life, and spreads such opinions abroad, that under her precept and example all must inevitably end in a cold and sterile individualism, leaving nought here which is worth an effort to save it from eternal loss.

You may have heard it said, that love, devotion, and reverence for women are no longer in order among men. Do not listen for a moment to the horrid suggestion. Those sentiments may not be in fashion; they may be concealed; they are deep in the hearts of men all the same. It is averred that now nobody falls in love; that the age of sentiment is past;

that the young look on each other in a hard, practical way, inconsistent with romance or enthusiasm. God help the society in which it comes to that! Let us waste no time in recrimination. There is some ground for these reproaches: is there not fault on both sides? Fix the responsibility where you will; divide it, by just measure and just balance; but, as for the evil, think not to mend it by any of the nostrums of the day. If men have lost their chivalry, if women have lost their power, let both seek to repair their losses by the road of penitence for sin and correction of fatal mistakes. Let the man ask God for a clean heart and a pure soul; let the woman pray to be simple in tastes, modest, chaste, and a keeper at home. Let us all get down on our knees together, and cry to God for the strength and courage to abandon our excesses, to lead honest lives, to keep good hours, to renounce the vain follies, the lying ostentations, the falseness and wickedness of a generation that has gone very far astray, and deeply revolted from Christ and the Gospel. Some time society must get back to better and more rational ways. Who can

help so much to reform it as the woman, whom God has so honoured above the man? Let her remember this, that nothing can ever take her place to us. If she be true to herself, she will always see the proof of that assertion. If she abdicate her throne, and leave vacant her place in the heart and intelligence of her companion, be sure he will never try to find another to fill that place, nor ever cease to mourn for her; he may curse her, in the bitterness of his soul, for what she has done, but he must plod on alone as best he may, misanthropical, hateful, and like one upon whose journey has descended the darkness of a night without a star.

LECTURE IV.

THE SINS OF WOMAN AGAINST HER VOCATION.

IF you can recall the fairy-stories which we heard when children, you will remember that they began with the formula, "*Once upon a time.*" Some of our pessimists would set that prefix before all that we say in praise of the female sex. "Once upon a time, men had romantic thoughts of women; they loved to descant on their charms, their worth, their preciousness; fine speeches were the order of the day; there was a chivalry in society, which accorded to the woman an honour founded on sincere admiration and loyal devotion. But that was once upon a time, and the time is past. Such language befitted men holding somewhat romantic and transcendental notions of the mother, the sister,

the wife. We live in a wiser, if a harder, age; our eyes are opened. The old opinions cluster around an impracticable and impossible ideal; the facts do not accord with the fancy; society has undergone a change; we see things differently. It is nonsense to talk of women, or to women, in that way: they have heard enough of it; they want a different thing. Let there be a social reconstruction wherein the woman shall be shoulder to shoulder with the man, marching on her way without asking or caring for compliments or adoration. Great changes are come; greater are coming; the world must be reconstructed. Let the ideal woman, with her tenderness, her charms, her claim to respect and reverence, be bowed out of the company, and let us have, in her place, the actual woman—apt, in strength, boldness, and rough ways and speech, to hold her own wherever she may be."

Whatever truth there is underneath these sayings of the time—and doubtless there is some—there is also great exaggeration. I question not that the position of the woman has changed; I think, for the worse, in those

particulars about which a true woman will be most sensitive. The deference paid her is less: homage has turned to mere civility; the public invade her privacy, the newspapers print her name in full; she is treated with no more ceremony than if she were a man. But if these things be so—and they are; none can doubt it, and we admit it with pain—may not this be said, that for the change she is herself to blame? It is not the men who have wrought this; the follies, the sins of women have brought contempt on their name and cast a blight on their condition.

I feel great solicitude about the subject of this evening's lecture; I had rather not touch it at all. You may think that its selection is an instance of that disrespect to which I have referred. Not so. I hold the old ideas; I abhor and detest the modern development; before any woman who fears God, does her duty, and gives us, in her life and acts, the picture of a true and beautiful womanliness, I rise up to bless her, and do her homage. Do not misunderstand the design of this lecture, or the spirit in which it is given. God forbid

that any man, be he laic or be he priest, should stand by himself, in Pharisaic pride, to comment on the sins of women, to his own advantage or for his own entertainment! That would be unmanly, unjust. Men have no right to throw stones at her. The sins of men are rank; their follies excessive and without number; their rebellion against God horrible and defiant; they are worse than women: we should be compelled to believe this, even if facts did not substantiate it, on religious grounds. She through whom salvation came, must be maintained in grace to do a continuous and a noble work. I believe that women are morally the superiors of men; I see that in some instances they are becoming their superiors intellectually. Look at society! Is it not true that women, with much more time to read and study, are actually gaining on men? Throw them together; you will often find that they know more than the men; they are more cultivated, better read, better informed; men are behind them, because they are grinding everlastingly in the mill of business, read nothing but the newspapers, and know hardly any-

thing beyond the range of their monotonous mechanical existence. Much might be said in proof of the rapid advance, the actually achieved superiority of the woman of the day. It is, then, in no spirit of assumption that I shall say what I intend to say to-night: it is rather in the tone of remonstrance, of wonder, of expostulation. Why do they err as they do? Why lower themselves to our base level? Why should the queens abdicate their thrones, and go down into the ring, and act unseemly parts, and lay their honour in the dust? Let us think, this evening, of some things done by women, of which one might say that no woman, with a woman's heart and a woman's sense, could, after due reflection, justify them.

Sins fall naturally into groups or classes; and if I speak this evening only of one class of sins, it is because the time does not permit us to take a larger survey of the field. We shall limit ourselves, then, to these topics:

The lack of serious views of life, and the habit of turning the thoughts exclusively to enjoyment:

The degradation of the idea of matrimony,

as shown by entering into the estate for low and unworthy motives:

The deliberate determination of some married women to defeat the objects for which marriage was instituted; to have no real home, to avoid, first the pains, and next the cares and duties, of maternity:

The habit, where a home exists, of neglecting it, by spending most of the time away from it, running up and down in pursuit of excitement, and turning the children over to the care of hired servants:

The growing indifference to the chief of all social abominations, divorce.

These heads furnish ample material for sad and anxious reflection, for earnest remonstrance with those who by one or more of these by-paths are wandering away from the men whom they ought to be helping and saving, from the God whose name and law they ought to fear.

Generally I say this: that it is the faithlessness of woman to her mission and her duty which emboldens the arch-conspirators against her honour. Had not Christian women given

occasion to these noisy adversaries, had they stood to their principles, had they shown us the female glory and not the female shame, this world would have remained so true, so fast, in its loyalty and love of them, that their fanatical sisters would have woven their webs and tried their arts in vain.

"*She that liveth in pleasure*," saith the Apostle, "*is dead while she liveth.*" Measured by this rule, what a grave-yard is society! how many, how heaped together, are its dead! To live in pleasure, to enjoy the world, to put aside serious thought; how many are the households in which these are the leading principles of action! The mischief begins in the education of the children. The high and the humble are in fault alike. The humbler classes, inspired by a fatal ambition, strain every nerve to help their children up to a social rank above their own.* The higher classes, bitten by the same mania, think it the one thing needful to make their children conspicuous in society.

* See the chapter in "Eve's Daughters," by Marion Harland, where she gives that striking picture of the mother slaving for her over-educated girls. The book is full of excellent things well worth reading.

Take, for example, a mother, herself imperfectly educated, who lives, and moves, and has her being in the world: her one idea will be to give her daughters a favourable introduction into society, and make them popular and successful. That is, in her view, the serious business of life.

There are words in use among us which rasp the nervous system and fill men with disgust: one is that word "*success*." It is said, for instance, of some young maiden just flung forth into the sea: "She came out last month; she is a success." It is said of another, "She is not a success." I know not what deeper degradation could overtake a young woman, on her first emergence into the general view, than to be weighed in that commercial fashion and made the subject of such base praise or condemnation. Do you know the story of the life of many a young girl? It runs thus:

She is sent to school, a mere child, with a child's fresh soul, a child's sweetness, a child's honest heart. She is placed in the hands of conscientious, painstaking teachers. Here is a great work: to educate; to draw out the mind,

the soul; to fit for a true woman's work here, and for a higher life hereafter.

The girl goes on well; she is thoughtful, earnest, apt; she loves her studies, she makes rapid progress; her eyes begin to see the outlines of a noble mission; and thus, let us say, she reaches the age of eighteen. It is the very time when that higher education which, rightly understood, we believe in, and would give her, should begin. Two or three years more would *make* the woman that should be.

But, no: the mother comes to take her away. Outside, is that strange, wild Maelstrom which they call society: "The floods are risen, the floods lift up their voice, the floods lift up their waves." The mother comes, herself, perhaps, a weather-beaten wreck such as that whirlpool has left her: the child must be taken away, introduced into society, launched on the tide, made, if possible, a success. In vain are protest and prayer. Her teacher begs for a year or two more; she herself would rather stay; she would rather learn; it is hard to be stunted by the strong drink of the world's intoxication. No matter; let us have an end of remon-

strance. Go she must; and she goes. And with that, in many a case, the door into a nobler life is shut.

And what will society do for this poor child of God? What will she learn there, she who has just missed the chance of entering God's great temple of thoughtful, earnest, religious souls? What school is this to which she next proceeds? This will society do for her: It will begin with the alphabet of pleasure and vanity, and teach her the whole science through words of one, two, and three syllables, line upon line, precept upon precept, till she becomes mistress of the theory and an adept in the practice. It will work her hard in the tread-mill, till the freshness of life is faded; it will toss her about like a shuttlecock; it will drag her up and down from show to show; it will fill her eyes and ears with things which she had better never have seen or heard. This shall she learn there: the art of leading a false and empty life; the art of blowing bubbles, gleaming with prismatic hues outside, and within mere breath and slimy suds. Whatever in her is ingenuous, pure, religious, must be rubbed

out; the nonsense of the innocent life is doomed. She must be successful; and success in these days is measured by the distance from modesty, simplicity, and quietness. Let us leave her to this undoing, and a year or two after let us come back and see what we have. Here, surely, is another person; old, hard, unmade, as it were, and made over again; thoroughly converted to the spirit of the age; she can banter, jest, and make repartee; she listens without flinching to talk which but a year ago would have brought the bright blush to the maiden cheek. She is well prepared for her graduation into the higher forms of pleasure and enjoyment. She has no more simple tastes; she laughs at her own old virtues; she has no aspiration beyond the charmed circle in which she is held enchanted; all her convictions are shaken; home is tiresome, old friends are a weariness; God and religion are very far away.

To measure the power of what is called "society" to ruin the best type of womanhood, one must take note of the falseness of the standards set up there. Success in that field

is due to exactness in following certain lines marked out; and several of these lines lead away from what makes sweet and lovable womanhood, and right on to whatever most deforms the sex. Take, for instance, the following: Mark the readiness with which girls adopt the manner and the talk of men; even using their slang expressions, and permitting them, when in their company, to treat them with something of the freedom and careless ease which men observe toward each other. No matter what a girl's age may be, if she is old enough to be in the company of men, she is old enough to insist on their deference and respect, to demand in them a conduct marked by courtesy and good breeding. She ought to teach the men about her that she, by right of her sex, is the superior, and require, as a condition to the pleasure of her society, a recognition of that fact. But how many girls there are who would receive such suggestions with derision! That is not the spirit of the age! To attract attention, to reap applause, one must take another line: be on easy terms with men, permit a freedom bordering on

disrespect, laugh at their rudeness, affect somewhat of their manners, and join with them in censure of decorum and propriety as old-fashioned and out of date.

Note again, the habit of making light of everything, and turning all things to a jest; the persistent determination to seek amusement everywhere, and to trifle with whatever occurs. It comes, in great measure, of the living on the bad literature and weak novels of the period, of which little can be said but that they are as dreadful as the creatures whom they depict. To write books with a serious purpose seems to have been almost given up. Modern novels present little better than very exact pictures of the most worldly, the most useless, the most objectionable of the men and women of the day. To portray them accurately, and then to leave it to the reader to make his judgment of them, seems to be the aim of the authors; not to condemn vice, nor to praise virtue, but merely to amuse with the exhibition of a Gallery of Social Rogues, of false-hearted women, impure men, and beings without religious faith, honourable impulse,

or reverence for any good thing. On this pabulum the young are fed; they assimilate what they devour; they turn, by degrees, to what they have learned to consider interesting and worthy of imitation.

And note once more the ambition to appear clever and brilliant; the desire to say bright things, or hear them said. It may become a pest. You meet with persons (pray not too frequently) who seem to be ever striving to give to their speech an epigrammatic form, as if to impress you with an idea of their power, or who look at you (most deferentially if you happen to be in prominent position), expecting you to make, ere long, some witty or deep remark, which they treasure in memory, and set to your account in the intellectual empyrean of the mutual-admiration circle.

But I must stop in this enumeration of some of the absurdities of the day, results of modeling after false standards; of pedantic bookiness; of affected indifference to everything; of the absence of any high aim in life. The ideal of a calm, simple, earnest womanhood is thus brought to contempt, and replaced by a poor

substitute made of worldliness, heartlessness, flash, and froth.

In a society thus dedicated to pleasure, offering low ideals, and planted with way-marks leading off from duty and from God, the young women who, from their high position and vast responsibilities, ought to do great things for us in their time, are prepared for the next step downward: for the marriages so often made—mere mockeries of the sacred name. Girls so trained, and having imbibed the spirit of the age, will have their fixed ideas of the reason *why* it is well to be married; and in numbers of instances the drift of their training is shown in the motives with which they enter into that estate. To marry for an establishment is the commonest of all things. But there are those who appear to have married chiefly in order to get a freedom to enjoy the world which they could not have in their single condition. We have not yet come so far as to proclaim entire liberty to all the daughters of the land; a girl is still under certain restraints; she *must* observe certain proprieties; she *cannot* do as she pleases. But, once a wife—O

execrable profanation of the word!—she is independent and free; she may go where she likes, and do what she will; no one can complain but her husband; and as for him, she will very soon teach him that she has no idea of being bound by his wish or command. Not to sacrifice herself to one individual did she marry; but rather to have the free run of every avenue leading to enjoyment in the world.

We reach, in this subject of marriage, the most grave of all; the place of the worst sins. Nothing degrades women so effectively, or deteriorates them so hopelessly, as their errors on this subject. The motives for which they enter into marriage, their conduct in that estate, their readiness to break the contract as soon as they find it burdensome; the utter recklessness with which young persons marry, the very facilities afforded, making it as easy and simple a thing to be joined in marriage as to go for a drive of an afternoon; the effect of existing laws to make married persons practically independent of each other and to give them divided interests; and the increased and increasing facilities for divorce: these are among the

darkest evils of the time. There is something appalling in the total irresponsibility of many married people. Young persons contract marriage with no apparent sense of the gravity of the act; without a thought how they will be required to behave toward each other in the coming years; without reflecting that to live together after God's ordinance involves a test of the entire moral and religious nature, and trials which can be surmounted only by the charm and talisman of mutual respect, honour, and love. The last idea to enter the head seems to be that of duty. Every one knows how easy it is to get married here. No license is required; no publishing of banns; no religious service; the mere statement, before witnesses, that they enter the matrimonial relation, makes them man and wife. What wonder that it is lightly thought of? It is regarded as a venture, it is a frolic, it is an amusing episode, it is a dubious experiment. If it does not result satisfactorily, never mind; some way will open to crawl out of the thing, and be gay, happy, and contented once more. Some marry for money, some for position,

some for more freedom; we are taught now by the advanced thinkers that love is the last of all motives, hardly to be regarded to-day as a rational motive. Now, when self-interest, in some one of its Protean shapes, is at the bottom of this proceeding, the moment self-interest is crossed or disappointed, they kick against the restraint. It is no uncommon thing to hear it said some time after a marriage, perhaps within a year or two: "She cares nothing about her husband now; they are hardly ever together. Poor thing! she made a great mistake in marrying him, and she sees it now and admits it." Yes; but that is not all. She goes her way as calmly and coolly as if nothing extraordinary had occurred; as if the marriage, after all, was not a thing of any consequence; as if it had enjoined no duty and imposed no responsibility. And no one seems to think the less of her, nor to be at all shocked or distressed; it is quite a matter of course now —a little, trifling blunder, nothing serious; let the carnival proceed; let us all be bright and cheerful as ever; let us gad about in the sunshine, and lose no joy of life. Excuse these

illustrations; I cannot explain without them. *Irresponsibility:* it is the blight of the day. Somebody has blundered; no one is responsible. *Irresponsibility:* no account to give, no one to call you to account. The easy-going recklessness which we see about us is the result of a training in which the law of God and the rule of the Church are set, not first, but last of all.

To speak of marriage leads me to mention deeper evils than those already referred to. There is one of which I hardly know how to speak; but it should be named in any catalogue of the actions by which women degrade themselves, refuse their natural mission, and earn the just indignation and wrath of earth and heaven. I refer to the wilful intention and resolve to defeat the first of those purposes for which Holy Matrimony was instituted. It comes looming up on the view of this century as a great, a growing, an almost national crime. It comes with the denial of the sacramental character of holy matrimony, the winking at the systematic violation of its primal design, and the easy indulgence to any who, for any reason

or no reason, wish to have it annulled, and to be free to make new contracts.

Briefly, then, the foundation of the home is the first thing intended in matrimony. It is a holy estate, and all who make up the home are inheritors of the covenant promise and partakers in the sanctity of that sweet relation to each other and to God. But some deliberately resolve that there shall be no home, or at least that it shall be as narrow, as limited, as possible. They wish, it may be, to avoid pain; they wish to shirk the duty of the parent; they wish to be free to enjoy the world; they are held and bound by a supreme spirit of self, lording it over every other consideration. Arts, base and black, arts which under the old law were punished by death, are used to carry out these impious and absurd resolves: impious, because it would not be possible more grossly to outrage God's law than in this way; absurd, because a marriage, contracted with that latent or expressed purpose and intention, is a contradiction in terms, a misnomer, a fraud on society and on the Church. This shall not be undertaken "*unadvisedly or lightly, but*

reverently, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God." So runs the beautiful and earnest precept. And hear again what they say: "*To have and to hold, according to God's holy ordinance; and thereto I give thee my troth.*" What troth is this? and who are these, who flout God's holy ordinance, and begin their lives with a rebellious purpose in their minds and a sacrilegious invocation on their lips?

Now I say that it is the woman who is mainly responsible for these sins: by her luxury, her extravagance, her addiction to the pleasures of the world, her recklessness of duty, her irresponsibility. I believe that this is done ignorantly, or in unbelief. But, I say, as God's priest, and in His name, that this act, of deliberately preventing the formation of a home, is a crime, and one which brings down curses thicker than the pellets of hail, on the community that it defiles and blights. Doubt not that there is, overhead, a God of justice by whom actions are weighed. And when you see the march of Socialism and Communism, the growth of Nihilism, and the organization of bands of fiends whose weapon is dynamite,

and whose aim is the mere destruction of property and human life, recognize the merited scourge of Heaven on an age which tolerates and legalizes these and similar violations of God's first law.

I proceed to speak of a sequel to these fatal crimes. It is the neglect of the home, where there is a home. Home is made up, where God's full blessing has been granted, of the father, the mother, and the children. But where now, in many a home, is the father? Where the mother? And where the children? What is the moral power, the influence, of the home, over its constituent elements? God's own ordinance, and the oldest of all, older than any civil government on earth, older than any ecclesiastical organization, should not this divinely-founded society keep up its sacramental life? And yet we see all about us the wrecks of homes, the shadows and ghosts of homes, the parodies of homes; slowly are dying out the home-life, the home-influence, the home-training, the home-religion. The father is, by God's law, priest over his household; to him should they look as a witness for that God

who gave him his rank and title. The mother is, by God's law, the watchful, intelligent, industrious head over her children and her servants; the fair, serene witness to the peace and purity of the heavenly type after which the earthly house is modeled. Where now are these factors in that wondrous building of God? Both abdicate their position. The father throws off his duties on the wife, and goes his way; God never hears his voice in the house-prayer, the children have no teaching from him, their priest, their confessor, their confidant. The mother must be free for her pleasures. Her first thought is how to keep the little ones out of the way; they shall be turned over to the nurse, the governess; now and then to be sent for and noticed, most of their time to pass out of sight, and out of mind. And what is this home, out of which its heads fly, anywhere and everywhere, to find a pleasure which it cannot give, and in which the principal teachers of the children are hirelings? I ask their pardon, sometimes, for calling them hirelings, or thinking of them as such. For I have seen, amid the ruin of such empty and deserted homes,

humble and pious servants, who had the heart which the mother seemed to have lost; who actually, in God's sight, were more the mothers of the children than the vain, forgetful creature who bore them; and in honouring such servants I have looked with amazement and horror on that dereliction; with amazement that any mother can thus resign what to a true woman should be the sweetest of all duties; with horror at a neglect which marks the ebb of the tide, and involves the penalties which must ensue when the *decadence* shall be complete.

We come to one thing more: to the awful subject of Divorce. On that I have so much to say, that I must defer it until we meet again.

LECTURE V.

DIVORCE.

HEAR the words of the Gospel written by St. Mark, in the tenth chapter, at the second verse:

"And the Pharisees came to Him, and asked Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. And He answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept. But from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined

together, let not man put asunder. And in the house His disciples asked Him again of the same matter. And He saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."

I feel at a loss in beginning this lecture: at a loss and in doubt.

It has been said, and truly, that it is impossible to use too strong language on the subject of Divorce. I am at a loss and in doubt.

At a loss for terms adequate to state the kind and degree of the peril now menacing the social order and Christian civilization: doubtful, whether it be not now too late to rouse men to a sense of the danger, and check the movement of the age.

For evil, growing, may get such headway that to stop it requires more than human strength. The enemies appear to be without number, their onset all but irresistible; and this is felt most painfully by those who, here and elsewhere, have ventured to confront this evil

of the hour, this horrible shape which assails our honour and our purity, and strikes at the heart, the key-stone of our civilization, the home.

This chapel has in its pavement five furnace registers, one at each corner and one at the centre. If, now, by some murderous art, it could be so arranged that deleterious fumes could be made to pour through those vents, whereof the whole congregation should languish and presently die, no worse would have been done than that which is now in progress, throughout this country, in the matter of divorce. Moral poison is in the air we breathe: it threatens the life of man, woman, and child; it stifles, it chokes, it makes the whole head sick and the whole heart faint; it kills and dries up from the roots the love of chastity, virtue, and honour.

I am not alone in speaking on this point: I do but repeat the words of men much higher in position in the Church, and with larger responsibilities. And I say again, what I said when I began, that I am at a loss how to deal, in any brief time, with a subject of this frightful character, and doubtful whether, by

any human help, we can be saved from the ruin at our doors.

Indeed, it is not possible to do more at present than to speak briefly of a few topics connected with the subject; and those selected are as follow:

(*a.*) The point aimed at in facilitating divorce.

(*b.*) The theory which underlies these attempts.

(*c.*) The connection of this movement with some social and religious heresies; and—

(*d.*) The position of the Church on this question.

And, first, as to the thing aimed at by the promoters of easy divorce. It is not the relief of persons unhappily joined together. That is secured under all Christian statutes. In fact, divorce is of two kinds. There is a divorce which consists in the temporary separation of persons who cannot live together in safety; they, however, remaining husband and wife. That is a simple matter; it works but little harm; it gives a just relief. If married persons find it impossible to live together in peace; if

one be hard, cruel, brutal, dissolute, dangerous, it is right that the other should be allowed to withdraw from the peril, and that they should remain apart till they come to a better mind. But such a separation, often necessary, differs entirely from another—the divorce *a vinculo*, as it is called—a divorce followed by a new matrimonial alliance with some other person. Keep those two always sharply distinguished in your thoughts. They were always so distinguished until recently, in the law of the State and of the Church. Divorce, with the privilege of marrying again; divorce which absolutely separates the married, destroys the home, and throws the road open to other alliances—that is the abomination with which we have to deal to-day. Unquestionably that is the point aimed at: that a divorce for any cause shall carry with it the freedom to marry again; and that the causes for which divorce may be obtained shall be made so numerous that any married couple may easily be parted under the form and shadow of law. This, of course, is the ultimate goal of a movement which has at length startled and shocked

thoughtful and religious men. Indeed, they who dare to speak out their mind, say distinctly that they want entire freedom; that men should have the right to put their wives away for any cause, and women to dismiss their husbands at will. Public decency and the lingering power of religion forbid the concession of that liberty; so that, for the present, they must be content to go through legal formalities in order to a separation. The grounds for granting such separation should, however, they say, be numerous enough to accommodate all desiring it; and, therefore, the point to aim at now, in view of the end ultimately to be attained, is to make divorce so easy that it will become as common as marriage itself; whereupon the legal proceeding will be given up as practically unnecessary and a mere bit of superfluous formalism, and license shall reign supreme. Do not say that I overstate the case. In one part of New England they have fully prepared the way for what may come. In the State of Maine a divorce, full and absolute, may now be granted, not merely for any one of a long list of specified causes,

but, adds the statute, "by any Justice of the Supreme Court, whenever, in the exercise of a sound discretion, he deems it reasonable and proper, conducive to domestic harmony, and consistent with the peace and morality of society"! Think of that! A divorce may be granted on any ground approved as reasonable by a judge! And what will they do where judges invested with such a power, shall be placed in office by the vote of a people unrestrained by the curb of religion, and debased by the morals of a revived paganism?

It was the old law of the State of New York that divorce *a vinculo* could only be granted for adultery, and in the case of such a divorce the guilty party was prohibited from marrying again during the other's lifetime. Of late, however, that law has been tampered with; though I believe that the rules of the Code of Civil Procedure have restored it in its old stringency. But, be the law now what it may, it has become practically all but a dead letter since a recent decision of the Court of Appeals, that parties prohibited from marrying in this State, if they go to another and there contract

matrimony, must be regarded as validly married on their return. Thus is the statute made of no effect; and thus are the barriers removed which once kept the plague from our own door-steps and homes. What we need is a uniform system of law regulating marriage and divorce throughout the United States; but how can we get it? or who can predict what it would be?

It has been well pointed out, not long since, that when things reach the state toward which they are drifting; when one marriage may be lightly set aside and another entered into; when a man can have wife after wife, and a woman husband after husband, getting rid of each in turn by a system of facile divorce, we shall have reached the condition of the Mormon, with this sole difference, that his polygamy is simultaneous and ours consecutive. The Mormon can have as many wives at once as he can maintain: the skilful divorcer can also have many, only not all at once, but one after another, as fast as he can decently or indecently make the desired changes. Nay, under that system, were it generally established, there

would be no more wives, strictly so called; but these wretched creatures, each taken by some form deemed sufficient by the law, each dropped by some form apt to that purpose, not bound to the man for life, but only during his pleasure or her own, these degraded and humiliated beings would not be wives, but simply and actually registered concubines.

And this brings us to the second point. What is the theory underlying this steady movement for increased facilities for divorce? This: that marriage is a civil contract and no more. Now, such contracts are terminable at the pleasure of the parties. This is the idea of marriage, which has been sedulously taught for long time past: it is like a business partnership. Nothing is necessary in forming this social partnership, but ability and consent; and when the partners find it to their interest to dissolve the firm, they ought to be free to do so. Remember, the notion that marriage is only a civil contract, terminable, like other such contracts, at the pleasure or convenience of the parties, is and must be in the brain of our advocates of easy divorce. The idea of

its having a sacred character, or implying religious duties, or involving as a third party a GOD whose word and will are elements in the transaction, must have vanished away.

Now, then, we are ready, in the third place, to state the connection of this evil with some of the social and religious heresies of our time.

The civil-contract theory of marriage is strictly in place in any system which banishes God from the world and from human life. It is in order in rationalized communities, in societies which have ceased to be Christian. Some of us are reproached for not being in accord with the spirit of the age: how can we be, if the spirit of the age, and its movements, are practically atheistic? To induce men to ignore God's word and reject His law, to show men how to do without God, is the avowed aim of the advanced thinker of the day; and the view of marriage, as a civil contract only, falls in with the rest of his programme.

Unfortunately, we cannot stop at that. The truth must be told, however painfully it may strike the unaccustomed ear. This is not only

a sign of an infidel society; it is also an upgrowth from the principles which form the evil side of Protestantism. There can be no doubt as to the genesis of this abomination. I quote the language of the Bishop of Maine; "Laxity of opinion and teaching on the sacredness of the marriage bond and on the question of divorce originated among the Protestants of Continental Europe in the sixteenth century. It soon began to appear in the legislation of Protestant states on that continent, and nearly at the same time to affect the laws of New England. And from that time to the present it has proceeded from one degree to another in this country, until, especially in New England, and in States most directly affected by New England opinions and usages, the Christian conception of the nature and obligations of the marriage bond finds scarcely any recognition in legislation, or, as must thence be inferred, in the prevailing sentiment of the community." *

* It is hardly necessary to remind the reader of the obsequiousness of Cranmer in the matter of the divorces of Henry VIII., of the conduct of Luther and Melancthon in the case of the Landgrave of Hesse; of the abortive "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*" in the reign of Edward VI., and of

This is a heresy, born and bred of free thought as applied to religion; it is the outcome of the habit of interpreting the Bible according to a man's private judgment, rejecting ecclesiastical authority and Catholic tradition, and asserting our freedom to believe what we choose, and to select what religion pleases us best.

These, then, are the relations of the movement toward breaking up the family and the home; it comes of the system of naturalism, it thrives best where men fear God's law and God's word the least; it is the dark stigma on Protestant Christianity, a stigma which I trust that earnest and religious Protestants will do their utmost to efface; it is helped on by every man who holds what are known as "liberal opinions." It may be temporarily held back by whatever of power remains in the Holy Catholic Church; but it tends toward a state of things which is the dream of the atheist, the communist, and all who would fain make a society from which the faith and fear of God shall have been driven away, and in which

John. Milton's tractate addressed to Parliament on the '*Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce.*'

even the name of God may, if possible, be unknown.

It is time for me, after having dwelt thus long on the Divorce-Abomination—for by that title and by no other should it be known among Christians *—to state to you the teachings of our Mother the Church of God on the subject of Holy Matrimony. Hear them, and contrast them with the heresies of the rationalistic schools.

Marriage is not a mere civil contract. It is a divine institution. It makes a man and a woman one flesh. It binds them together for life in a union never to be dissolved. It gives them one nature, one life, one aim, common interests: they should be one in thought, mind, will, love; in each other they should find their full and entire happiness.

Nowhere is this so beautifully brought out as in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. The union of the husband and the wife is effected, not as human partnerships are made, but by

* See Tract No. 39, Church League Series, 'The Divorce-Abomination': to be had on application to John F. Cabot, Secretary, 18 Liberty Street, New York.

Divine power. It is "a great mystery," a great sacrament.* One flesh, each is to the other as his or her own self. A man must love his wife, because she is himself, and no man ever hated his own flesh. A woman must be subject to her husband in everything, for love's sake, and in love, and because she is to him as the Church is to Christ. Their union should be holy and without blemish. The household should reflect the glory of the Church, which is without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. There is no shame there, no dishonour: marriage is honourable, holy, blessed of God, the joy of angels, the bond of peace and of all virtues.

Can such a union as this be dissolved, under any circumstances, so that the parties, or either of them, shall be free to form another? Granted, that marriage is often most unhappy; that owing to the weakness, the folly, the treachery, the sin, which are characteristic of human nature, some men and women find their union to be the contradiction of the design of God, and so

* "*Sacramentum hoc magnum est*": Ephes. 6 : 32. The English word "mystery," the Latin "*sacramentum*," alike indicate the presence and work of supernatural power and Divine grace.

intolerable that they must be parted: and grant that they are so parted: should either be free to marry again?

If marriage were, as the rationalist says, a mere civil contract, a mere human partnership, that question could be settled by the State law, on the principles which regulate civil contracts and partnerships.

But if not; if it be a holy ordinance; if it is God who joins them together—then God only can answer the question before us, and the one thing to be asked is, What has God said about it?

Thus, on the question whether divorce with privilege to marry again may under any circumstances be permitted, we men have nothing to do but to open the Bible and ascertain God's will on that point.

But God said: "*They are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.*" (St. Matt. 19: 6.)

And, again, God said: "*Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put*

away from her husband committeth adultery." (St. Luke 16: 18.)

The words are as clear as the lightning which cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west. They lay down the general law.

But it is said that to every such law there are exceptions: is there any exception to this?

That depends on the meaning of one word in St. Matt. 19: 9. Our Lord says that, for one cause, a man may put away his wife and marry another: "*fornication.*"

It is not absolutely clear what that word means.

It may possibly mean infidelity after marriage.

Or it may mean impurity before marriage.

I cannot discuss the question here. But mark: that is the sole exception; and it is a mere peradventure that it includes post-nuptial sin.

Yet, on that peradventure, and because of that shadow of doubt, the benefit of the doubt is given. In the Church there have been, from of old, a stringent and a less stringent view.

The stringent rule is this: that, though the

married may be separated so as to live apart when they cannot live together in peace, yet are they still man and wife; and no new matrimonial relation can be formed. They may come back to each other; to strange flesh they cannot go. And I think that must have been what the Lord meant, and that it ought to be the rule of the Church.

But yet, as there is the shade of a doubt, a less stringent rule exists. It is the rule of our own branch of the Church, and we must follow it. Divorce, with the privilege to remarry, may be granted, but for one only cause: when adultery has been proved. And then the innocent party may marry again.

Beyond that the Church will not go; and to that extent she goes, only on the chance that it was what our Lord meant.

As for other causes, she recognizes not one. Divorce, on any other ground whatever, carries with it no privilege to either party to remarry. Her clergy are positively forbidden to marry such persons; the connection is regarded as adulterous, and the sacrament is denied to persons living together in that state, unless

on their repentance, or in the article of death.*

This is the position of the Church; thus revering God, does she seek to stem the tide of the age. And loyalty to her involves stanch loyalty to her principles and attitude on this terrible subject. It means, allow me to say, much more than a formal submission to her canons. It means that you should give her your cordial, hearty support; that you should act and speak always as asserters of her wisdom and justice in this matter; and that, whenever you meet in society persons who are not in sympathy with Christian law on this point, but tainted with the moral pestilence of the time, you should never permit them to remain in doubt where you stand, nor acquiesce in their disregard of the Word of God and the first principles of the Christian religion.†

* See 'Digest of Canons,' title ii, canon 13, *of Marriage and Divorce.*

† I quote, as follows, from an address by the Rev. A. C. A. Hall, formerly of the Church of the Advent in Boston, delivered last year:

"It is pleaded (and with a certain plausibility) that, desirable as a high standard of marriage and divorce undoubtedly is in general and in the abstract, yet that strict legislative

I spoke to you, last Friday evening, of the recklessness with which marriage is contracted,

enactments concerning the indissolubility of marriage bear very hardly upon individual cases—as where a person is thus bound to an utterly worthless or perhaps cruel partner.

"In reply to this objection I will simply read the words of two eminent secular authorities, entitled to respectful consideration, both on account of the weight of their opinions, and as expressing the mind of thoughtful persons generally.

"Hear the words of Mr. Joseph Hume on the subject:

"'We need not' (he says) 'be afraid of drawing the marriage knot the closest possible. The amity between the persons, where it is solid and sincere, will rather gain by it, and, where it is wavering and uncertain, it will be the best expedient for fixing it. How many frivolous quarrels and disgusts are there, which people of common prudence endeavour to forget when they lie under the necessity of passing their lives together, but which would soon be inflamed into the most deadly hatred, were they pursued to the utmost, under the prospect of an easy separation! We must consider that nothing is more dangerous than to unite two persons so closely in all their interests and concerns as husband and wife, without rendering the union entire and total. The least possibility of a separate interest must be the source of endless quarrels and suspicions. The wife, not secure of her establishment, will still be driving some separate end or project, and the husband's selfishness, being accompanied with more power, may be still more dangerous.'[1]

"In like manner speaks Lord Stowell, the eminent English lawyer and judge: 'It must be carefully remembered that the general happiness of the married life is secured by its

[1] Philosophical Works, iii, p. 208, quoted by Woolsey, p. 264.

and the apparent want of the sense of responsibility on the part of many persons who have

indissolubility. When people understand that they *must* live together, except for a very few reasons known to the law, they learn to soften, by mutual accommodation, that yoke which they know they cannot shake off. They become good husbands and good wives; for necessity is a powerful matter in teaching the duties it imposes. If it were once understood that, upon some disgust, married persons might become legally separated, many couples who now pass through the world with mutual comfort, with attention to their offspring, and to the moral order of civil society, might have been at this moment living in a state of mutual unkindness, in a state of estrangement to their common offspring, and in a state of most licentious and unreserved immorality. In this case, as in many others, the happiness of some individuals must be sacrificed to the greater or more general good.'[1]

"To these may be added the following from Dr. Whewell, especially for the sake of the warning against rashness in entering upon marriage ties: 'It is said that an engagement to retain our affection through life is absurd, since we cannot command our affections; and that to bind two persons together, who have begun to hate instead of love each other, is to inflict upon them a useless torment. But though we cannot command our affections, we can examine our hearts before we make the engagement. When this is faithfully done, married life itself, well-conducted, tends to give permanency to affection; and nothing can more impress upon us the necessity of being faithful to our hearts in the choice we make, than the knowledge that the step, once taken, is

[1] Quoted by Woolsey, p. 267, from a decision cited by 'Coleridge on Blackstone,' 1,440.

undertaken that holy estate; of their low ideas of duty, and their absorption in entertainment and pleasure. I spoke of the levity with which we comment on domestic infelicity, as if it were to be expected as a matter of course; on the apparent lack of surprise or sorrow when alienations occur; of the indifference with which we look on, when names are dishonoured, reputations blasted, and homes broken up. I doubt not that these alarming phenomena are the direct result of demoralization caused by the looseness of civil legislation. Certain it is that, as facilities increase, so increases the number of those who avail themselves of them. The easier it is to get divorces, the greater will be the demand for them, and the greater the number of the divorced; and the more familiar we become with the sight of divorce,

taken for life. Again, this same knowledge, that the union cannot be dissolved, tends to control the impulses of caprice, ill-temper, and weariness in married life; and to keep two people together, and on the whole tolerably happy, who might have separated on some transient provocation, if divorce had been easily attainable. And thus, the exclusion of divorce tends both ways to the promotion of conjugal love and conjugal happiness.'" — Elements of Morality: Book v, chap. xiii, § 974.

the less will marriage be held in esteem. Now in this far and fast drift to the bad, it is the woman who must suffer most; her interests are more directly involved than those of the man; it is she who should view with most solicitude the rapid weakening of the public conscience as to the sin and crime of these separations; for, in the general moral decline in which they multiply, she will be dragged down to her former degradation, past the chance of recovery or rescue.

Let the woman remember that it is the religion of Jesus Christ which has sanctified her person and exalted her sex; that every word of Christ touching her relations to man, as maid, as wife, as widow, is for her a word of life; that there is not, and cannot be, a work more urgent for her, or more essential to her safety and honour, than to see that those words of Christ are kept perpetually before the community, blazoned and illuminated, as the very talismans of social security. Harm enough has come to her already under the pretence of a bettering of her condition. The law of God makes the man and the woman one flesh; it gives her rights

which he must recognize; on him is justly thrown the duty of labouring for and maintaining the home. But the law of man in revolt from God tends to divide the man and wife; it treats them as two independent persons, it gives the woman a separate position and separate interests; she can hold property in her own right, she can sue and be sued apart; they are only in a religious fiction one. From this condition, with separate interests and separate responsibilities, it is an easy step to personal separation. But when, if ever, woman attains a complete independence, she may find herself crushed under burdens too great for her to bear: there are signs of that already; they multiply; one traces them in the bitter saying that now it is the women who have to support the men. And the social and moral wreck of the woman will be complete, when the conspiracy against Holy Matrimony has come to a triumph. Then this will be the history: that she whom God lifted up from the estate of concubine and slave, and crowned with honour and glory as a Christian wife, will, after having turned away from God to follow her own devices, sink back

to be once more man's concubine and slave. The conditions may vary, to match the altered aspect of the world; the thing will be the same: the lapse will be into the old misery and bitterness; and once more shall the fetters be riveted on her limbs, and once more shall the iron enter into her soul; and "there shall be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth."

No warnings of the hour are graver than those connected with the topic of this evening's discourse. I commend them to your reflection, with the prayer that you may see what this bodes to your honour, your safety, your children, and your home, and that you may come down to steady, patient effort to save what is left of honour and righteousness, and to "strengthen the things that remain, that are ready to die."

LECTURE VI.

A MISSION FOR WOMAN.

NOTHING can be more tender than the care of our Lord for the daughters of His House. His words on the cross, when He commended His dear Mother to the disciple chosen to be mystically her Son, have given the key to the voices of the Church since that day. Through a woman came the Redeemer into His world; therefore in the world as redeemed has the woman been evermore held in honour and reverent affection.

And if in these lectures aught has been said harshly or otherwise than in the spirit of tenderness, it has been through inadvertence and against the design of the speaker; and he would fain now recall any such words, and protest that it was in devotion to her, and with all respect, nay, with a strong sense of her need of sympathy

and brotherly help, that he has said what he has said.

And now he would close this course, by a few words on the subject of the true mission of woman. Very respectfully, very affectionately, and very earnestly, would he speak; and with deep solicitude as to the result.

Looking for a mission—for a work to do: that is the attitude of many women to-day, of many pure, true, sweet souls. It is a thing much dealt with in the popular writings of the age; notably, it may be said to form the subject of one of the most powerful, the most fascinating, and the most unsatisfactory books ever written. What is George Eliot's 'Middlemarch' but such a book; fascinating, brilliant, powerful, and cruel and cold as the devil and death! Was there ever a sweeter soul than poor Dorothea? Was there ever a more merciless sacrifice than that of her warm heart, noble mind, and active spirit—first, to a cold-blooded, crabbed pedant, who makes of her a mere mechanical implement in his dry and unprofitable work? and, next, to an empty-headed Bohemian, not worthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of her shoe? And

what does this immolation appear to suggest? This, if anything clearly: that woman seeks in vain, in society as now constituted, a mission worthy of herself. In other days, say in that when St. Theresa prayed and worked, there was a mission for Dorothea; now there is none; she is cheated and defrauded, she can expect no more than to be bound helpless on the altar, and slain alive, and so sent out of the world with a broken heart and empty hands, having wrought nothing worthy of herself, because fast held and bound in the iron of our modern systems. Now this is one-sided and unreal from first to last: it is far from the truth; there is work to do; there are positions in which it may be done and conditions under which it can be carried on, as laudably, as gloriously, as of old. The moral of 'Middlemarch' might be accepted, if the choice for Dorothea lay ever between men of the Casaubon and the Ladislaw types: between faith without love and brains without faith. But to refute the conclusion, one has but to recall certain precious and helpful visions, which, indeed, are not vision but reality; visions, which the malevolent romancer hides from us,

but which you can see any day, and of which I would say a word or two before proceeding:

Look, then, at the Christian homes, throughout the Christian lands, where holy virtues and graces flourish in an atmosphere of faith, little if at all disturbed by the storms which vex the outside world. There is the wherewithal to make other homes as sweet and fresh as these; and in such work many a woman who fears God and keeps His commandments finds her vocation amply fulfilled.

Look, again, at the opposite pole to this—the life of the unmarried woman who has given herself up to her Lord, in community. In the convents and religious houses of our American and English sisterhoods, many women have found a true and worthy mission. And in those houses there burns this hour as bright, as warm a fire of devotion to God and to suffering humanity as ever rose heavenward in what they commonly call the ages of faith. Go to one of those houses, learn the works of their inmates, fathom their intentions, and read the catalogue and acts of their martyr souls, and you will say that ours is also an age of faith,

and that beneath the habit of the Sister of Mercy to-day there beats as true a heart as ever throbbed in sympathy with human pain and need, and that women of the highest culture and the rarest gifts find in that life, made up of never-ending activity and never-ceasing prayer, a mission worthy of their sex, and needing nothing to perfection after its kind.

And, yet again, look at those who, though neither in the quiet home, nor yet in the seclusion of a sisterhood, do noble things; women with whom, in their fortunes here on earth, God has dealt strangely, denying them their hearts' desire, yet not leaving their hearts empty, nor their hands idle. Think of the single women, whose lives in God's sight are glorious, who have found out ways of helping others, who have learned that love and sacrifice are the greatest words in our language. Some, by their writings, helpful and wholesome; others, by devotion to philanthropic pursuit—as teachers, nurses of the sick, visitors of the poor and the prisoner, mothers to the orphan, helpers to the clergy, beautifiers of the age by their artistic skill, ministering angels in

half broken-up households—all these come forward and show us that there is still a mission for any devout and earnest woman who seeks it in faith and patience.

And let me speak also of the working women and girls of this city, of whom I have known such great numbers in my twenty-three years of ministry in this parish. Well do they fulfil their mission in their own place. I have seen them going to their hard tasks and returning thence; they have told me of their trials and perils, of what they had to face, of the strife to live pure, chaste lives on starvation wages. I have seen poor working-girls growing up like fair white lilies, in places in this city where it would seem impossible for them to escape; and I thought that these, also, toiling for their parents, their reckless brothers, their child-sisters, were showing us wonderful things, and fulfilling a mission which God will crown some day as among the highest works in His kingdom.

Such visions as these do wonderfully clear the thoughts: and he who has beheld them knows well what value to put on speculative, unwholesome writings, which leave the impression

that the woman of to-day has no career before her, and that her life is that of one walking in a nightmare of doubt and perplexity, burned up with the fever of hopeless aspiration, and finding neither health in the atmosphere nor help from man or God.

This question, then, about a mission for woman: what shall we say of it? This, at first: that no one with a heart, and the love of God in it, and sympathy for the sorrows of the world, and a sense of duty and responsibility, need look long without finding one. But let me suggest one difficulty in the way. There may be some here present who see no duty direct and plain before them, while yet they wish that they did; who have abilities, and social position, and influence which they might turn to account; yet seem to themselves to be sitting idle all the day long. To such let me say, that they might be helped in their perplexity by attentively considering the signs of the times, and learning what it is that leaves so many women with the sense of having nothing to do with their life, and hides from them the very path by which royal deeds may be done.

No mission is a true one which does not somehow or other give glory to God, or lead one's self, and those for whom one works, upward and nearer to God, the beginning of our strength, the end in whom we rest. Whatever, then, in the age, in one's thoughts, or in one's own life, hides God from view, as the supreme end, prevents those who seek a mission from finding one worthy of that name. The very word "mission" has a spirit-stirring sound; it is like a call from without; a Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us!" To think seriously of a mission, is to feel the pressure of the world outside. The needs of the age, whatever they may be, are to a man at once his inspiration and the guide to his steps. He goes forth, moved by sights which actually meet his eyes, beckoned by hands of flesh, by eager faces, which bid him make haste. Look, then, at this age; see what it suggests; that will show what is to be done. In every age there is some one thing to do: the signs of the times declare what that one thing is; and, lo! the mission is announced.

Now I suppose that no one can be so blind

as not to see one striking sign of the present age. However remarkable our progress, however brilliant our triumphs, however marvellous the changes of the face of the world, something else impresses the thoughtful more deeply than this outside pageantry of material and scientific advance. A movement may be traced everywhere; a drift bearing down men, states, and races! In general features it is one and the same, observe it where you will; in force it varies, but it tends one way. The drift of which I speak is away from religion and toward unbelief; the point toward which it tends is that which large numbers have reached, and at which even now they are organizing and arming for appropriate deeds; the point at which man rids himself of the last vestiges of faith in God, or love or fear of God, and seeks to erase the name of God from the page of human knowledge, and to banish God finally from society and from the world.

Look where you will, this portentous sign of the last days may be seen.

In Germany, religion is fast dying out among the people; literature, art, science, politics,

poetry, music, popular amusements, attempt to fill the void; the life of the student in the university, of the statesman in Parliament, of the artisan, the tradesman, is led by the light of philosophy and not by faith; the houses of God are empty, the Lord's-day is no longer holy, but a secular festival; the Church, once of great power in the land, is reduced to a function of the state Government.

In Russia, the outlook is one which almost baffles conjecture. The nation is kept in ferment by a small and obscure faction, whom it would seem impossible to exterminate or even to intimidate. These agitators avow themselves atheists; they believe in nothing whatever but dynamite, and by this they promise to overthrow everything that exists.

In France, we watch with painful interest the unrolling of a programme of atheism. The sight is more horrible than that presented anywhere else to-day. In Russia, an atheistic sect assaults a Government which at least professes the Catholic faith and protects the Church; but in France the Government itself leads the way toward the hoped-for rejection of God by the

nation. There the religious orders have been robbed of their property and turned out of their homes with a cold-blooded brutality recalling the spoliations in England in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. The crucifix has been torn down from the walls of the school-rooms; the teachers have been forbidden even to name God. All things point toward the revival of the horrible scenes of 1793 and 1871. It is the devilish cry of the leaders in these movements: "We have turned God out of the schools; and we shall not stop till we have driven Him out of the world."

Turn to England: look at the drift of the age in our dear old home. Mark the secularization of the universities; the placing rationalistic professors in the chairs once occupied by the great theologians of the Church. Note the progress of democratic ideas, which, amid those venerable institutions, mean nothing less than revolution, with destruction to the Church and spoliation of her property; and read the signs of the times in the influence, even within the Establishment, of that Broad Church School which stands but a very few inches outside

the portals of the House of Scepticism and Infidelity.

And what shall be said of our own country? To read, thoughtfully, the public journals of any one week, gives the data for a reply. Chiefly through foreign influences, imported from Germany and France, or under the pressure of the English Rationalistic Schools, we move along with the general drift. Our young men fall away; our young women lose the attributes of Christian maidenhood; it is thought absurd to be behind the age, to try to hold back when such swarms are flying past us driven by the wind. Here, especially, is going on the disintegration and decay of Protestant Christianity; men look on with sorrow and fear, not knowing what is to come up among the ruins. And still, among us, as elsewhere, loud and long swells the cry, "Away with God, away with God!"

Let us next consider the effect of this downward drift toward godlessness on those natures which are not upheld by their faith. Such persons are among us—higher and lower characters; and the malady affects them with appropriate signs.

The higher natures descend into mere pessimism. They confess, with the French sceptic, that it is awful to think of a world without God; yet they can see no proof that God exists, and so they pass under the cloud; despairing of everything, finding life not worth living; deeming death, which at least dismisses men from this present unintelligible state into nonentity, the only good to be looked for.

But the lower natures revolt from that stage of darkness and despair. They say: "There may be no light beyond, but at least we have the light of time and of this present world. The philosophy of animalism, the spirit of secularism, at least, point to the means of enjoyment; let us drive off care by such helps as they afford." And so, they begin with the pleasures of the senses: they taste, touch, handle; they worship beauty, they deify health, vigour, and the animal powers; with these they make a temporary heaven. These things they do who can: and where it is not possible, since the conditions to that kind of happiness may not always be had, there are other avenues open; the study of the physical process, of the secrets and wonders of

the natural world, and of human philosophies; the service of the state and the secular order: in these may be found a higher grade of satisfaction, and relief from the torture of the thought that there are no prospect and no hope beyond.

So this is the movement of the age; to banish God from the world, to bring Religion, with her mysteries, her traditions, and her solemn ritual, to an end; to expel her from view as a degrading superstition; and to cast man, for happiness, or something which shall be called by that name, back on himself; on the resources of his own mind; on the work of his own hands. Nor can we say of this that it is not simple and logical; for if there be no God, man must be to himself whatever the religious hold God to be; a beginning and an end; his own light; his own strength; his all-in-all.

Now, I must say, and do say, without fear of being refuted in the statement, painful as it is to make or hear, that much of the agitation on the subject of the *status* and training of women is connected with the movement of which I have been speaking. If really there is no God, or if (which comes to the same thing

practically) the existence of God cannot be affirmed with certainty, and the questions of religion are involved in an obscurity so complete and so hopeless that they ought to be ruled out of the art of living, then surely the child ought not to be vexed with them in his training, any more than the grown man in his life-work. Nor yet can any of those solutions of the mystery of our state be tolerated which Religion offers. And when thinkers who have not God in all their thoughts, and workers who recognize no superhuman power or grace, take up the subjects of the rights of women, the duties of women, the education of women, they must of course reject religion as a factor or a guide, and deal with their problem on rationalistic and infidel principles. And I say that a great part of the agitation, or the laborious industry expended on those subjects now, and especially what takes the popular eye, is connected with the movement of the age away from God. I do not allege that all perceive this; I believe that many sincere yet uninstructed Christians are engaged in these proceedings; but I say that they are in a current,

the set of which they do not perceive. Nor do I criticise those leaders in the movements now referred to, who avow their scepticism, and pretend to be no other than they are. We know where such men and women stand, and honour their frankness. But with you it is another matter. We must criticise, we must blame Christians who compromise themselves and their religion by taking part in movements essentially anti-Christian. That some of you may have thoughtlessly erred in this thing is possible. That there are those here who will be invited to do this is certain. And when the tempting summons comes, implying, as it does, a compliment to your intellectual strength, your intelligence, and your sympathy with the "grand advance of the age," reflect on what you are about to do, and prove the thing by the simplest and surest of tests. You hear of the education of women, of co-education of the sexes, of emancipation of woman from bonds—*what* bonds the Lord only knows! Now, try the test. Suggest to the ardent, able, and eloquent advocates of new departures on these points, that the training of every girl should be

based on the theology of the Incarnation, and that she should begin with a profession of the Nicene Creed. I tell you in advance that you will be laughed to scorn; and that derisory ridicule ought to open your eyes to the truth. All the world through, men are in revolt against God's word and law; the sceptic, the rationalist, the agnostic, are making prodigious efforts to direct public opinion, to control the press, and to imbue the community with their principles; honestly, no doubt, and under the impression that Christianity is a superstition, the Bible an uninspired volume, and the Church a barrier to progress. They know their own mind, and comprehend what they are about. And the leading advocates of women's rights, female suffrage, and similar projects, are either in open league with those revolutionists, or mute when in their company.*

* The author of a book entitled 'English in Schools,' speaking of the system of using all possible means to foster a morbid habit of conscious acquirement, says:

"I more than suspect the primitive root of the difficulty is just here: That, having grown into a secret disrelish of the old religion of our fathers, as being too objective in its nature, and too firm and solid in its objectiveness to suit our taste, we have turned to an idolatry of intellect and knowledge;

Here, then, is a mission for a Christian woman; for the daughters of the Church; for you who received your Christian names at the font, on whose heads apostolic hands have been laid to strengthen you with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, of knowledge and ghostly strength, who kneel before the altar to eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of the Lamb of God. Here is a mission worthy of yourselves; one which may be combined with your daily work; one which gives to you the disci-

have no faith in anything, no love for anything, but what we spin, or seem to spin, out of our own minds. So, in the idolatry of intellect, as in other idolatries, the marble statue with which it begins naturally comes, in process of time, to be put aside as too weighty, too expensive, and too still, and to be replaced with a hollow and worthless image all made up of paper and paint. And the cheaper and falser the idol is, the more eagerly do the devotees cut and scourge themselves in the worship of it. Hence the prating and pretentious intellectualism which we pursue with such suicidal eagerness. I must add, that of the same family with the cant spoken of before is that other canting phrase now so rife among us about 'the higher education.' The lower education, yes, the *lower*, is what we want; and if this be duly cared for, the higher may be safely left to take care of itself."—*English in Schools: A Series of Essays*, by HENRY N. HUDSON, Professor of Shakespeare in the Boston University. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1881.

pline which blesses self, the power to bless others. It is, to do what you can to stem the flood, to strive to revive the faith in the hearts of those who have lost it, to resist the forces of secularism and naturalism, and maintain the old Christian ideas. And of this mission let me say a few words.

It is, of all works that could be named, the fittest for a Christian woman:

1. Because she was at the beginning of all the trouble in the world. We are no sceptics nor novelty-mongers; we believe the old story of the Bible, reaffirmed by Christ and His apostles, that Adam was not deceived by the devil, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression. Now, to her with whom the wrong began, we look for the beginning of the right.

2. Because it was through her that redemption came; for the Saviour was made of the woman, bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh: she therefore did aid, in a divine mystery, toward the saving of the world at first; to her we look, of right, for help in all new trial.

3. Because she is the mother of men, and

the natural instructor and trainer of children; she stands, where man cannot stand, and each well-ordered Christian household attests her mighty power.

4. Because, unless she forfeit that influence by acts unsuited to her sex and unworthy of her glorious position, she must be the tower of strength to her age and generation. She stands for the best that man can know, for the sweetest that he can enjoy, for the faith which is life to his spirit, for the purity which is the shield of his soul. Let the woman be the true, real woman, and man will not think of disputing her sway, or rebelling under her sacred and divinely sanctioned rule.

And let me suggest one more topic for reflection, a terrible one indeed. Remember that in the woman are the poles of the good and evil in human nature. When good, she is the best of all that exists; when bad, the worst. Nothing is so lovely as a woman true to God and herself; nothing so frightful as a woman false to self and God. In the history of women you shall find extremes so wide asunder as to confound and terrify in the comparison. A

woman may be better than any man; she may be worse than any man: there is no conceivable impurity like that of the profligate woman; no hate so dire and implacable as woman-hatred. Remember the female furies of the French Revolution, the Menads rushing on Versailles and screaming around Marie Antoinette in her awful sorrow; the *Petroleuses* of the French Commune; the women conspirators and co-workers of Nihilism, used by men as precious above all others for their subtilty and ferocity, merciless, pitiless. Was ever such contrast as this? There be Mary of Bethany and Herodias; Monica and Messalina; Anne of Brittany and Margaret of Valois; Elizabeth of Hungary and Frédégonde; Madame Louise de France and Demoiselle Théroigne; our Sisters of Mercy in this city, and those children of the devil, who, during our draft-riots in 1863, disgraced once more the name of woman by acts of obscene brutality not to be spoken of. Contrast these types of your own sex; they form the opposite poles, toward the one or the other of which you yourselves must incline; for who ever keeps an exact

equilibrium between the evil and the good? True it is that the best things become, if corrupted, the worst. In that fact we find the justification of our course in speaking to women as I have ventured to do; in warning the thoughtless, in awakening the slumberer. Reflect; pray; ask of God the grace without which no soul can stand secure. And, oh! remember this—not only that you must choose your side between the false and the true, the wrong and the right, but also that, if you diverge, and take, half unconsciously, the way toward the gulf, there are sly, fierce women behind you pushing you on, and trusting to make use of you for their own purposes when it is too late for you to retreat; women attended by men and youths whom they have kindled with the wine of their sorcery, and prepared to play their part in the drama of the future. Be warned; for the hour is portentous; and the signs of foul weather multiply all around the social horizon.

These reflections supply the motives to enter on your mission. Let the steps of the Christian woman be these:

1. Let her solemnly consecrate herself, at the altar of that God who abhorred not the Virgin's womb, to a life-long devotion to "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, lovely, and of good report," renouncing the temptations that are in the world, and especially the everlasting temptation to be wise concerning the sin and guilt of the world, and to have the eyes opened, and to be as gods, and to know good and evil.

2. Let her take as models for her study the noble images of history; the blessed Mother of God; the holy women of old; the Christian types of virtue and holiness; such characters as Shakespeare portrays, Queen Katharine, Cordelia, Perdita, Hermione, "infallibly faithful and wise counsellors, incorruptibly just and pure examples, strong always to sanctify even when they cannot save."

3. Let her rebuke, by her example, her erring sisters, whether they dishonour their name by open revolt from God and the Church, or disgrace and defile their persons and their fair fame in scenes of dissipation and in the occu-

pations of a life given up to pleasure and passed exclusively in the vortex of empty revelry and selfish enjoyment.

Such mission as this can be carried out by any baptized woman, in any grade of our social system, and in any position; by the wedded and by the single, by the matron or the maid, by the mother or the child, by the rich or by the poor, by the lady who stands at the head of society, and by her who toils with her hands in the hard lot of service and for the gaining of her daily bread. To be a simple, faithful Christian woman, a pure and sincere daughter of the Church; to do whatever her hands find to do, and not to do aught inconsistent with that profession, is a mission loudly called for by an age which may be more bettered and helped by the sight of one life led in God and to God's glory, and rich in the fruits of faith, than by all the talk that dribbles on us from popular platforms, and all the dreams wherein they walk as in a vain shadow who set up for the lights and oracles of our unhappy day.

Christian women, daughters of the Church,

believe me. We men want your help. You can best give us what we need, by being most unlike ourselves; by showing us, when we meet, what is to us a wondrous and lovely mystery, correspondent to what may be in our own nature, so framed as to harmonize with it in excellent accord, but something which has been woven together, beaten out, wrought to its strange and winning excellence, under conditions entirely different from those which have made us what we are. And you can give us what we need; and none but you can; and you can help and cheer us, best, perhaps, just now, by your silent prayers, your consistency, your loyalty to the womanly ideal, in the fatal drift of these years of a century fast passing away. Let the world alone; let things alone which do not concern you, and for which neither man nor God can hold you responsible. Be true to your homes, to vows which you have taken, whatever they may be, whether to your Lord in His ordinances, or to man under the sanction of religion; be true to husband, to children, to friend, to the practical duties o daily life, and above, below, around, we shall

feel the influences of your virtue and strength, and shall be refreshed, in your ennobling company, with the multitudinous blessings of peace.

THE END.

Bungay:
CLAY AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS.